

Spring 1989

# Rustic warriors: Warfare and the provincial soldier on the northern frontier, 1689-1748

Steven Charles Eames

*University of New Hampshire, Durham*

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholars.unh.edu/dissertation>

---

## Recommended Citation

Eames, Steven Charles, "Rustic warriors: Warfare and the provincial soldier on the northern frontier, 1689-1748" (1989). *Doctoral Dissertations*. 1572.

<https://scholars.unh.edu/dissertation/1572>

This Dissertation is brought to you for free and open access by the Student Scholarship at University of New Hampshire Scholars' Repository. It has been accepted for inclusion in Doctoral Dissertations by an authorized administrator of University of New Hampshire Scholars' Repository. For more information, please contact [nicole.hentz@unh.edu](mailto:nicole.hentz@unh.edu).

## **INFORMATION TO USERS**

The most advanced technology has been used to photograph and reproduce this manuscript from the microfilm master. UMI films the text directly from the original or copy submitted. Thus, some thesis and dissertation copies are in typewriter face, while others may be from any type of computer printer.

The quality of this reproduction is dependent upon the quality of the copy submitted. Broken or indistinct print, colored or poor quality illustrations and photographs, print bleedthrough, substandard margins, and improper alignment can adversely affect reproduction.

In the unlikely event that the author did not send UMI a complete manuscript and there are missing pages, these will be noted. Also, if unauthorized copyright material had to be removed, a note will indicate the deletion.

Oversize materials (e.g., maps, drawings, charts) are reproduced by sectioning the original, beginning at the upper left-hand corner and continuing from left to right in equal sections with small overlaps. Each original is also photographed in one exposure and is included in reduced form at the back of the book. These are also available as one exposure on a standard 35mm slide or as a 17" x 23" black and white photographic print for an additional charge.

Photographs included in the original manuscript have been reproduced xerographically in this copy. Higher quality 6" x 9" black and white photographic prints are available for any photographs or illustrations appearing in this copy for an additional charge. Contact UMI directly to order.

# **U·M·I**

University Microfilms International  
A Bell & Howell Information Company  
300 North Zeeb Road, Ann Arbor, MI 48106-1346 USA  
313/761-4700 800/521-0600



**Order Number 8921933**

**Rustic warriors: Warfare and the provincial soldier on the  
northern frontier, 1689-1748**

**Eames, Steven Charles, Ph.D.**

**University of New Hampshire, 1989**

**Copyright ©1989 by Eames, Steven Charles. All rights reserved.**

**U·M·I**  
300 N. Zeeb Rd.  
Ann Arbor, MI 48106





**RUSTIC WARRIORS:  
WARFARE AND THE PROVINCIAL SOLDIER ON THE NORTHERN FRONTIER,  
1689-1748**

**BY**

**STEVEN C. EAMES**

**B.A., University of Southern Maine, 1976  
M.A., University of New Hampshire, 1982**

**DISSERTATION**

**Submitted to the University of New Hampshire  
in Partial Fulfillment of  
the Requirements for the Degree of**

**Doctor of Philosophy**

**in**

**History**

**May, 1989**

This dissertation has been examined and approved.

Robert C. Gilmore

Dissertation Director, Robert C. Gilmore,  
Professor of History

Marc L. Schwarz

Marc L. Schwarz, Professor of History

Harvard Sitkoff

Harvard Sitkoff, Professor of History

Janet L. Polasky

Janet L. Polasky, Professor of History

David H. Watters

David H. Watters, Professor of English

May 1, 1989

Date

**ALL RIGHTS RESERVED**

**1989**

**Steven C. Barnes**

**ABSTRACT**

**RUSTIC WARRIORS:  
WARFARE AND THE PROVINCIAL SOLDIER ON THE NORTHERN FRONTIER,  
1689-1748**

**by**

**Steven C. Eames**

**University of New Hampshire, May, 1989**

Utilizing the period of the early French wars as a whole, this study examines the experience of war on the northern frontier and its impact on the provincial soldier. Part One explores the warfare itself, with chapters on the initiation of war and the New England military system: garrison houses and community defense, provincial forts, patrols and raids, expeditions, and logistical problems associated with weapons and ammunition. The second part discusses the provincial soldiers themselves, including recruiting, officers, training and fighting spirit, the physical experience of combat and the tactical response to Indian warfare, wounds and medical care, and the spiritual and psychological impact of war.

Using recent works in social/military history as a basis of comparison, the author reevaluates the role and effectiveness of the colonial soldier, and concludes that the prevalent impression of the provincial as a poor soldier

drawn from the dregs of colonial society is inaccurate. The concentration on major events has fostered the interpretation that provincial war efforts were inept, but this superficial examination ignores the complexity of warfare on the northern frontier.

The governments of Massachusetts and New Hampshire had to defend a long frontier while mounting offensives against two enemies, the French in Canada and the Eastern Indians. In order to accomplish their military objectives they had to: raise soldiers; secure the services of specialists such as military engineers, gunsmiths, gunners, pilots and guides, doctors and interpreters; gather provisions and clothing; and contend with shortages of weapons and ammunition. The provincial governments were also dependent on England for logistical and naval support, and the English generally viewed colonial military efforts as a side show to be supported only when convenient to British strategy and plans.

Although decried as amateurs without proper military discipline or training, the New England military system actually tuned to the rhythm of frontier war. With units cemented by the bonds of kinship and community, led by officers known for their integrity and experience, New England soldiers became quite adept at *petite guerre*, where success depended on individual expertise and action, not harsh discipline and mindless automation.

**To Kathleen,**

**Many years ago we took a walk up the road --  
this is but another step in that wonderful journey.**

## PREFACE

Historical research rarely proceeds in a straight line. The historian boldly pursues an embryonic thought or notion down a path filled with so many turns, forks and dead ends that the final result often has little connection to the original destination. So it was with this project. John Shy's provocative article, "A New Look at Colonial Militia," provided the initial idea.<sup>1</sup> At the time the article was written, Shy believed that although the "evidence gathered so far is not full nor does it admit of any quantitative conclusions, ... it does indicate that a growing number of those who did the actual fighting were not the men who bore a military obligation as part of their freedom."<sup>2</sup> This thesis prompted an analysis of soldiers from Dover, New Hampshire who performed active duty in 1745, which in turn led to the present study. But what began as a relatively straight-forward and simple quantitative test of Shy's thesis has twisted and turned and grown so much since that

---

<sup>1</sup> John Shy, "A New Look at the Colonial Militia" in A People Numerous and Armed: Reflections on the Military Struggle for American Independence (London, 1976)

<sup>2</sup> Shy, "A New Look at the Colonial Militia" in A People Numerous and Armed, 29.



beginning, the final form bears little resemblance to the incipient concept.

During the course of my research I found considerable inspiration from the work of the "new" military historians such as John Keegan, Sylvia Frey and J. A. Houlding.<sup>3</sup> They have examined in intimate detail the effect of war and army life on the soldier and have provided new insight while destroying old stereotypes. Encouraging this approach in 1981, Richard H. Kohn recommended that historians studying the social history of the American soldier should reconstruct "the life and the environment of the enlisted man in much greater detail and depth than has ever before been attempted." As Kohn suggested:

By first asking the most basic descriptive questions and using the methods of other disciplines, military historians can recover the fullness of the military experience. Initial research might concentrate on the assumptions that the military has brought to the acquisition, training, and government of soldiers, then the regulations of armies and navies, the uniforms and the equipment, the drill and fatigue duty - in short. the minutiae of military life in its entirety.... histori-

---

<sup>3</sup> John Keegan, The Face of Battle: A Study of Agincourt, Waterloo and the Somme (New York, 1976); Sylvia Frey, The British Soldier in America: A Social History of Military Life in the Revolutionary Period (Austin, TX, 1981); J. A. Houlding, Fit For Service: The Training of the British Army, 1715-1795 (Oxford, 1981); John Keegan and Richard Holmes, Soldiers: A History of Men in Battle (New York, 1986)

ans could create so realistically the physical and mental world of the enlisted man that the time-honored reliance on literary sources and on the artistry of fiction could be diminished.<sup>4</sup>

This, then, is the direction my research has taken. The intention to conduct a quantitative analysis of colonial soldiers has blossomed into a social history concentrating on the impact of war and military life on the New England provincial soldier.

Peter Karsten recently wrote that the "new" American military history concerned recruitment, training, combat motivation, effect of service and war on the individual soldier.<sup>5</sup> This study hopes to accomplish just that. After reviewing the historical perceptions of the provincial soldier in the introduction, the first part analyzes warfare on the northern frontier by breaking the conduct of the war into its component parts and examining each in detail. The first chapter describes the coming of war, in both the formal sense as a declaration between nations or people, and the intimate manifestation of that war in the form of an attack. The chapter also introduces the military system of New England, delineating the administrative militia from the

---

<sup>4</sup> Richard H. Kohn, "The Social History of the American Soldier: A Review and Prospectus for Research" American Historical Review, 86 (1981), 564.

<sup>5</sup> Peter Karsten, "The 'New' American Military History" American Quarterly, XXXVI (1984), 389.

active provincial service, and discusses the initial response to war -- pursuit of enemy raiding parties.

Chapter Two focuses on the preparation of frontier communities to defend themselves, and the use of fortified or "garrison" houses, then a discussion about provincial forts follows, including their construction and garrisons, and their usefulness in drawing the fury of large enemy forces away from frontier towns. Scouting parties, including their conduct and the development over time of effective raiding techniques, are explained in Chapter Four, and Chapter Five describes the Anglo-American cooperation necessary to attempt the reduction of Canada itself. Finally, the last chapter in Part One details the logistical problems associated with the procurement of weapons and ammunition, without which the war could not have been fought.

By studying the conduct of war in the early French conflicts, Part One provides a foundation for the subsequent discussion of provincial soldiers themselves. Recruiting practices, including both incentives and compulsion, and an analysis of what type of individual actually performed active service begins Part Two. Provincial officers, how they were chosen and their dual responsibilities of leadership and the enforcement of military regulations, are discussed in the next chapter, followed by an examination of training and discipline, and the source of fighting spirit. Chapter Ten depicts the physical experience of combat and the tactical response to Indian warfare. The final chapters

present a review of wounds, accidents and illness, medical care, and the psychological impact of war, manifested primarily in a bitter hatred of the Eastern Indians.

In proposing his formula for research, Peter Karsten also suggested that historians keep "a comparative eye" on foreign research relating to the topic, and in this I heartily agree.<sup>6</sup> The New England provincial soldier shares an experience with his brothers throughout history, from the Roman legionnaire to the marine defending Khe Sanh - that experience is war. His story is a part of military history as well as early American history, and the use of comparative analysis in the preparation of this work has proved very enlightening, especially when comparing the colonial soldier with the British redcoat of the same period. Such analysis has led to a re-evaluation of the New England soldier and a better understanding of the military structure of colonial Massachusetts and New Hampshire.

The decision to confine my research to the early French wars was first based on the knowledge of other work covering the military history before and after that period, in particular the research done by Fred Anderson on the Seven Years War.<sup>7</sup> While I do not agree with all of Anderson's conclusions, most of the work presents a valuable study of the provincial units which served along side British regi-

---

<sup>6</sup> Karsten, "The 'New' American Military History" American Quarterly, XXXVI (1984), 418.

<sup>7</sup> Fred Anderson, A People's Army: Massachusetts Soldiers and Society in the Seven Years War (Chapel Hill, NC, 1984)

ments in that "Great War for Empire." In addition, it occurred to me that William Pitt's escalation and the resulting heavy involvement by British regulars may have influenced the way New Englanders approached that war in comparison to the previous conflicts, although, in comparing my conclusions with Anderson's, this influence appears to have been minimal.

More importantly, I felt that a study of the way New Englanders fought a foreign foe relying mostly on their own resources might provide valuable insight into how they approached another foreign war on their own, namely the War for Independence. This has led me into the historical controversy concerning the evolution of the American military in the eighteenth century, which was recently reviewed by E. Wayne Carp. The debate concerns the following question: Was the American military experience unique or did it "increasingly ... resemble its English or European counterpart". As it concerns New England during the early French wars, I find myself on the side of what Carp calls the "exceptionalists". I have found no evidence of "anglicization" in my research, and will show that, even if the impulse was there (and there is precious little evidence of that, if any), the need did not exist until the War for Independence.\*

What I hope to show is that the story of New England's military effort in the early French wars is not a simple

---

\* Carp, E. Wayne, "Early American Military History: A Review of Recent Work", Virginia Magazine of History and Biography, XCIV (1986), 259-284.

one, and that the provincial soldier was not the incompetent amateur as he is so often portrayed, especially in comparisons with both his French and Indian enemy and redcoated ally. The governments of Northern New England and their soldiers operated under the severe handicap of having to fight wars without the immediate logistical, technological and financial support available to European nations. Like their French adversaries, they had to accommodate their European temperament to the realities of a wilderness environment and the Native American way of war. What made the New England soldier unique, or "exceptional", was what the New World had already taught him - adaptability.

So many people have assisted and influenced this work it is difficult to single them out. I certainly want to thank my advisor, Robert Gilmore, for allowing me the freedom to explore where my heart and mind led me, while still exerting the control necessary in such a project. I am also grateful to the rest of my committee, Marc Schwarz, Janet Polasky, Harvard Sitkoff, and David Watters. Their influence in the development of my ideas and writing skills over the years will never be forgotten. I only wish I had been able to utilize their experience and knowledge even more than I did. I want to thank Vincent Capowski, at St. Anselm College, who graciously read a few chapters and provided valuable suggestions and encouragements. Our many discussions concerning military history have not only been enjoy-

able, but provided an important sounding board for my ideas. I must also mention the influence of Darrett Rutman. A hard task master to be sure, but one who expunged naïveté and fostered a respect and love for the writing of history.

The writing of a dissertation affects not only the author, but everyone in his or her life. Commitments and responsibilities to very special people are ignored or truncated by the pressure to finish. Therefore, I have to acknowledge the support and understanding of friends and family, especially Steve Barden, Mike Meyerderks, Tom Nesbitt, Jon and Lauren Mack, Ken Grant, Bill and Rusty Babbitt, Carl and Barbara Coleman, Marty Mathews and John Kucher. My wife's parents, Natalie and Leonard Shean, have aided the effort with financial support and child care for their granddaughter (a job which they have found so "difficult").

The financial, moral and child care support provided by my mother, Margaret Hodges, is impossible to calculate. Throughout my life she has sacrificed in order to provided both my needs and whims, but no more so than in the furthering of my education. Her love and sacrifice will always be remembered (I doubt, however, that she ever expected that little Civil War uniform given me at the age of seven would go so far.).

Finally, I wish to acknowledge the influence and support of my wife and daughter. My daughter, Mairi, was born in the midst of writing this work, and there is no question

her needs complicated an already difficult situation, but the inconvenience is infinitesimal compared to the joy and inspiration which her beauty and personality give me everyday. . My wife, Kathleen, has been a rock of support for the nine years I have spent pursuing a Masters degree and Ph.D.. She has endured financial privation and a stressed-out husband with very little complaint. It is impossible to adequately describe the trials and stress involved in researching and writing a dissertation, only those who have experienced it can know. The individuals married to Ph.D. candidates endure the same trials and stress but receive very little in material compensation. I believe universities should award academic "purple hearts" to the spouses of all Ph.D. graduates -- I know my wife deserves one.



## TABLE OF CONTENTS

Dedication.....	iv
Preface.....	v
Abstract.....	xv
Introduction.....	1

### PART ONE: WARFARE ON THE NORTHERN FRONTIER

1. The Initiation of War.....	31
2. Garrisons.....	64
3. Provincial Forts.....	103
4. Patrols, Probes and Raids.....	134
5. Expeditions.....	186
6. Stores of War.....	229

### PART TWO: THE PROVINCIAL SOLDIER

7. Gone for a Soldier.....	271
8. Chosen to Lead.....	323
9. Battle Drill and Fighting Spirit.....	373
10. Facing the Enemy.....	422
11. The Wounds of War.....	467
12. The Legacy of Hatred.....	509
Afterword.....	541
Bibliography.....	546

"There was not a moment of doubt as to the choice of a commander, for Phips was imagined to be the very man for the work. One John Walley, a respectable citizen of Barnstable, was made second in command with the modest rank of major; and a sufficient number of ship-masters, merchants, master mechanics, and substantial farmers, were commissioned as subordinate officers. About the middle of July, the committee charged with the preparations reported that all was ready. Still there was a long delay. The vessel sent early in spring to ask aid from England had not returned. Phips waited for her as long as he dared, and the best of the season was over when he resolved to put to sea. The rustic warriors, duly formed into companies, were sent on board; and the sailed from Nantasket on the ninth of August."

- Francis Parkman, Count Frontenac and New France under Louis XIV, 246.

## INTRODUCTION

### THE NEW ENGLAND PROVINCIAL SOLDIER: HERO OR BUNGLER?

Scattered around northern New England are a few garrison houses which have withstood the attack of age and the elements. Altered by their various owners and hemmed in by modern construction, they are nevertheless a reminder of a time when red men and white men sought to destroy each other, when it was worth a life to harvest a crop or walk to a neighbor's house. Such reminders of the French and Indian wars run through the texture of New England like a fine linen thread. Appellations like Ambush Rock, Fort Hill or Garrison Street dot the regional geography, and even the names of the towns themselves, such as Goffstown, New Hampshire and Westbrook, Maine provide a direct link with those colonial conflicts.<sup>1</sup> The legend of our sturdy Puritan ancestors, blunderbus in hand, fighting off hordes of

---

<sup>1</sup> Goffstown was named for John Goffe, leader of numerous scouts who became a Lieutenant Colonel in a provincial regiment during the last French and Indian war: Westbrook was named after Thomas Westbrook who commanded the Provincial forces in Maine during Dummer's War. See William Howard Brown, Colonel John Goffe: Eighteenth Century New Hampshire (Manchester, NH, 1950); William Blake Trask, Letters Of Colonel Thomas Westbrook and Others Relative to Indian Affairs in Maine, 1722-1726 (Boston, 1901), 2.

screaming savages continues to hold a strong position in local mythology. In the latter half of the nineteenth century (a period now known as the Colonial Revival), the Centennial celebration, the final defeat of the western Indian tribes and the apparent closing of the frontier recalled to New Englanders their own Indian wars, and they assiduously recorded the legends and stories of those early years in their town histories.

Everywhere local historical societies preserved the relics of their heroic age -- an Indian war club, a collection of powder horns, a musket or sword which belonged to some long forgotten Indian fighter were carefully laid out in viewing cases with the appropriate labels, now yellow and faded. Perhaps the most startling artifact was preserved in the Memorial Hall Museum in Deerfield, Massachusetts. Housed in an old school building whose several floors overflow with memorabilia, the museum is an antiquarian paradise. As you pass among the shoes, farm implements, carriages, spinning wheels, and pewter mugs, you are suddenly confronted with a door standing by itself in the middle of the floor -- a witness to the night of February 28, 1704, when over three hundred Canadians and Indians sacked the village of Deerfield, killing thirty-eight and capturing one hundred and eleven of the inhabitants. During the course of that attack, the Indians chopped a hole through the door of the Sheldon house and, thrusting a musket through the hole, shot Mrs. Sheldon as she rose from her bed. The solitary

object in the Memorial Hall Museum is that very same door. Confronted with this venerable portal, the hole miraculously unrepaired, the mind endeavors to imagine the village on that night -- the bitter cold of a New England winter, the hideous shouts of the raiders, the sound of musket fire, the blows of the hatchets on the door, and the terror of Mrs. Sheldon as she started out of her bed. But in the end the imagination fails because this door, stripped of its supporting framework and original environment, stands by itself in an old school building amid the shoes, the farm implements, the carriages, the spinning wheels, and the dust.

Historians attempting to understand the French Wars and the soldiers who fought in them, have had to cope with the mythology of this period. Their interpretations and the observations of many contemporaries generally contradict the heroic image of the colonial soldier. British officers and government officials in particular viewed the provincial as ill-disciplined, unprofessional and incompetent. General John Forbes called colonial soldiers "a gathering from the scum of the worst people ... an extream bad collection of broken Innkeepers, Horse Jockeys, and Indian Traders." James Wolfe found the troops provided by the colonies "in general the dirtiest most contemptible cowardly dogs that you can conceive. There is no depending on them in action. They fall down dead in their own dirt and desert by battalions, officers and all. Such rascals as those are rather an

encumbrance than any real strength to an army." Other officers believed the Americans to be an "Obstinate and Ungovernable People, and Uterly Unacquainted with the Nature of Subordination in Generall ... There's nothing to be found among them all but Laziness, Neglect Disobedience and Disorder, all ill and eating Constantly ... [they are] the lowest dregs of the People, on which no dependence can be had, for the defense of any particular Post by themselves."<sup>2</sup>

While obviously less acerbic in their reaction, the opinions of many historians who have examined the history of the early French conflicts concur with the notions of these professional military men. The story, as it is frequently told, is a familiar one, and it easily leads to the conclusion that the New England war effort was not so noble and her soldiers not so heroic. Thrown into political limbo by the Glorious Revolution and the overthrow of Edmond Andros in the spring of 1689, an unprepared New England felt the destructive power of the Eastern Indians at Dover, New Hampshire in June, and suffered the loss of the village and fort at Pemaquid later that summer. During the following winter and spring, Count Louis de Frontenac, governor of New France, launched a three-pronged attack which resulted in the destruction of Schenectady, New York, Salmon Falls, New Hampshire and Fort Loyal in Casco Bay. Although William

---

<sup>2</sup> Douglas Edward Leach, Roots of Conflict: British Armed Forces and Colonial Americans, 1677-1763 (Chapel Hill, NC, 1986), 130-31.

Phips did capture the French fort at Port Royal in the spring of 1690, the subsequent failure of the Quebec expedition that fall brought New England to the brink of financial disaster. Events proceeded from bad to worse during the rest of King William's War. York, Maine was decimated in January, 1692, Oyster River, New Hampshire suffered a similar fate in the summer of 1694, and in February, 1696, the stone fort at Pemaquid, rebuilt at great expense by Governor William Phips four years earlier, was captured by the French after a token resistance and subsequently destroyed.

The Peace of Ryswick brought only a temporary halt to this string of disasters. The renewal of bloodshed occurred in early August, 1703, when five hundred Abenaki Indians under French leadership struck several towns on the Maine frontier. Thirty-nine inhabitants were killed or captured at Wells alone, and over one hundred from the other communities added to the toll. The following winter witnessed the destruction of Deerfield and the sad march to Canada of the over one hundred captives, a march so eloquently described by the Reverend John Williams. Throughout Queen Anne's War, as in the other French and Indian wars, New Englanders on the frontier were subjected to constant attacks by small parties of Indians who ambushed men working in the fields or women and children in their homes. The provincial forces seemed incapable of preventing these incursions.

In 1707 Massachusetts twice attempted to capture Port Royal but both efforts were frustrated by the apparent incompetence and dissentious behavior of the officers. Three years later they finally succeeded in taking the French fort, however, the effort to capture Quebec in 1711, this time with the assistance of British troops and naval support, ended in disaster when several transport ships struck shoals at the mouth of the St. Lawrence river, resulting in the loss of over nine hundred British redcoats and sailors.

Queen Anne's War came to a merciful end in 1713, and following a minor war with the Eastern Indians during the administration of Lt-Governor William Dummer (remembered chiefly for the death of the Jesuit Father Sabastian Rasle and the battle known as Lovewell's Fight in which the English commander and most of his men were killed), a period of peace allowed New England to catch its breath and even increase its borders with the establishment of new towns on the frontier. The start of the next war with France in 1744 brought New Englanders their greatest victory when they captured, with the help of the British Navy, the fortress of Louisbourg. But the reduction of Louisbourg proved to be the high point of King George's War, as this triumph was followed by more lost opportunities to capture Quebec and the usual bloody raids by the French and Indians, including the loss of Fort Massachusetts in 1746.



Through four wars with the government of New France and her Indian allies, the New England colonies had precious little to show for it. Two minor victories at Port Royal (in 1690 and 1710), and one major victory at Louisbourg in 1745, which was subsequently reversed by the Treaty of Aix-la-Chapelle, did very little to offset the catalog of bungled expeditions, fruitless raids, and the death and destruction along the frontier. Chronicling the disasters of Quebec in 1690, the destruction of York and Deerfield, and the debacle of Port Royal in 1707, historians have branded colonial government officials and military leaders as inefficient bunglers and the provincial soldiers as undisciplined amateurs. No other answer seems to explain the reason why the more populous and prosperous New England colonies (not to mention the rest of Anglo-America) could have so much difficulty defeating the smaller and weaker colony of New France, and, in fact, seemed to proceed from one military disaster to the next. "It seems incredible," wrote historian I. K. Steele, "that it could take seventy years to settle the military contest between Canada and her English-speaking neighbours to the south, since the population figures for 1689 suggested odds of nearly twenty to one against the Canadians."<sup>3</sup> Richard Marcus agreed with Steele, observing that "in view of the preponderance of manpower, wealth, and material enjoyed by the English North American

---

<sup>3</sup> I. K. Steele, Guerrillas and Grenadiers: The Struggle for Canada, 1689-1760 (Toronto, 1969), 13.

colonies in their struggle with New France, the historian cannot but be impressed by the failure of the English to protect their frontiers adequately and master their northern enemies sooner than they did. This embarrassing disparity between means and accomplishment was early evident."<sup>4</sup>

Most Historians blame this "embarrassing disparity" on inefficiency and lack of professionalism within the colonial military structure. Jeremy Belknap believed "a confusion of councils, and a multiplicity of directors" which led to "frequent changes of measures, and delays in the execution of them" underscored the incompetence of the provincial military establishment. Logistical support was appalling, "forts were ill supplied with ammunition, provisions, clothing and snow-shoes. When an alarm happened, it was necessary, either to bake bread, or dress meat, or cast bullets, before a pursuit could be made."<sup>5</sup> John Fiske agreed that the government of Massachusetts seemed to be its own worse enemy. During the initial phase of what became known as Dummer's War, the legislature interposed "obstacle after obstacle" in path of Governor Samuel Shute in his effort to wage war against the Eastern Indians. "Its

---

<sup>4</sup> Richard H. Marcus, "The Connecticut Valley: A Problem in Intercolonial Defense," Military Affairs, 1969 33 (1), 230

<sup>5</sup> Jeremy Belknap, The History of New Hampshire (Reprint of 1831 edition, New York, 1970) Vol 1, 296.

blundering conduct was not unlike that of the Continental Congress in the War for Independence."<sup>6</sup>

However, the most serious indictment has been made against the officers and men who constituted the colonial military forces. Their inadequate training and civilian ties prevented them from achieving the status of a true soldier. "Massachusetts had made her usual mistake," wrote Francis Parkman, "She had confidently believed that ignorance and inexperience could match the skill of a tried veteran, and that the rude courage of her fishermen and farmers could triumph without discipline or leadership. The conditions of her material prosperity were adverse to efficiency in war. A trading republic, without trained officers, may win victories; but it wins them either by accident or by an extravagant outlay in money and life."<sup>7</sup>

Recent studies of colonial military history have supported this traditional view. John Ferling found the "inadequately trained and frequently utilized militia forces had acquired an appalling reputation by the eighteenth century ... [this] disgraceful reputation was probably deserved,"<sup>8</sup> and Edward P. Hamilton elaborated on this point even more. "The average provincial was a poor soldier," he

---

<sup>6</sup> John Fiske, New France and New England (Boston, 1902), 242.

<sup>7</sup> Francis Parkman, Count Frontenac and New France under Louis XIV (Boston, 1896), 285.

<sup>8</sup> John Ferling, A Wilderness of Miseries: War and Warriors in Early America (Westport, Conn., 1980), 16.

wrote, "He could not well be anything considering his background and lack of training. Farm boys, sailors, fishermen, apprentices, and the jobless, all these were what the hurriedly raised armies drew upon to a large extent. Those who led them generally had little or no military qualifications. ... he was merely the leader in civilian life, the squire, the tavernkeeper or the merchant, translated overnight into the military leader."<sup>9</sup>

This inefficiency and lack of professionalism on the part of provincial soldiers has yielded two conclusions: first, the French were obviously superior in waging war in the New World, and, second, British regulars were needed to bring the wars to a close. The concept of French preeminence was advanced very early by historians. Jeremy Belknap observed that "there was a striking difference between the manner in which [war] was managed, on the part of the English and on the part of the French. The latter kept out small parties continually engaged in killing, scalping and taking prisoners ... on the other hand, the English attended only to the defense of the frontiers; and that in such a manner, as to leave them for the most part insecure. No parties were sent to harass the settlements of the French. If the whole country of Canada could not be subdued, nothing

---

<sup>9</sup> Edward P. Hamilton, The French and Indian Wars: The Story of Battles and Forts in the Wilderness (New York, 1962), 93.

less could be attempted."<sup>10</sup> Pervading this interpretation is the image of the Canadian *coureurs de bois*. "The Canadian yeomanry being mostly hunters, boatmen, or wood-rangers, and always in the woods, were about as skilled in forest warfare as the savages with whom they fraternized," wrote the nineteenth century historian Samuel Adams Drake.<sup>11</sup> "Every attempt to reach and destroy these vigilant foemen in their own fastnesses proved worse than futile. New England was losing ten lives for one; and in property more than fifty to one."<sup>12</sup>

Recently, the strongest exponent of the theory of French superiority has been the Canadian historian W. J. Eccles. According to Eccles, New France held out so long against overwhelming odds because they were "vastly superior to the Anglo-Americans in forest warfare ... [their success] was more a measure of New England's military ineptitude than of French strength ... it was not the Anglo-American frontiersmen or the provincial troops that ultimately conquered Canada ... Canada was finally conquered, after six years of

---

<sup>10</sup> Jeremy Belknap, The History of New Hampshire (Reprint of 1831 edition, New York, 1970) Vol 1, 295.

<sup>11</sup> Samuel Adams Drake, The Border Wars of New England. Commonly called King William's and Queen Anne's Wars (1897, reprint of 1910 edition, Williamstown, MA, 1973), 143.

<sup>12</sup> Drake, The Border Wars of New England, 55.

hostilities, by the Royal Navy and British regular soldiers."<sup>13</sup>

Since the colonies could not provide adequate troops for their defense, indicated by the evident superiority of the French and their Indian allies, British regulars were the obvious solution to the colonial military problem, according to British officials and many historians. "In the French wars the bulk of the important fighting was done by European troops," wrote Harold L. Peterson, "American troops in general lacked discipline and training in European tactics, and aside from a few brilliant exceptions they were considered unreliable by the English commanders."<sup>14</sup> In an article published in 1958 investigating "Anglo-American Methods of Indian Warfare" during the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, John K. Mahon believed that "an analysis of colonial Indian warfare reveals a simple truth which our folklore has tended to obscure: that trained regular soldiery, first the redcoats and then their American counterparts, were more important than unorganized frontiersmen in breaking the power of the Indians."<sup>15</sup> While frontiersmen "kept up a constant attrition", in the end it was the

---

<sup>13</sup> W. J. Eccles, The Canadian Frontier, 1534-1760 (Albuquerque, NM, 1974), 11, 139.

<sup>14</sup> Harold L. Peterson, Arms and Armor in Colonial America, 1526-1783 (Harrisburg, Penn., 1956), 155.

<sup>15</sup> John K. Mahon, "Anglo-American Methods of Indian Warfare, 1676-1794," Mississippi Valley Historical Review, 45 (1958), 254.

regular soldier in the ranks, armed with a musket and bayonet, who broke the power of the Eastern Indians.<sup>16</sup>

Taking this theory to its natural conclusion, historians believe that in dispatching regulars to America, both British and French, the Europeans forced their form of warfare on the New World. The provincial soldiers had failed through four wars to settle the Anglo-French colonial rivalry due to incompetence and their inability to fight the French and Indians on their own terms. The question would be settled by European troops in a European manner. I. K. Steele put this argument succinctly when he wrote,

North American pride in the ways of the New World has often led to the assumption that, in warfare as in everything else, the new men of the New World were better than the history-laden men of the Old. The defeat of General Braddock or the later success of the American Revolution can, with some misrepresentation, be seen as evidence of this superiority. Yet, it is obvious that, in the climax of the Anglo-French struggle, the Europeans came and forced their kind of warfare on the wilderness ... in the Anglo-American army there was relatively little struggle over adoption of the essentials of European warfare. As long as the Americans fought like guerrillas, they were wasting their major advantage -- manpower. The large influx of

---

<sup>16</sup> Mahon, "Anglo-American Methods of Indian Warfare, 1676-1794," Miss. Valley Hist. Review, 45 (1958), 274.

British troops after 1755, as well as more direct control of the fighting from Britain, ensured complete acceptance of conventional warfare.<sup>17</sup>

The logical progression contained in his view of colonial military history is difficult to ignore. Provincial soldiers were simple farmers who lacked training and discipline, and therefore, with a few exceptions, displayed a remarkable degree of incompetence and inefficiency in their martial efforts. The *coureurs de bois* of New France and their Indian allies were far superior to these New England farmers in waging war in the New World, and so the British government was forced to send regular troops who finally conquered New France by the use of European military methods. But if the initial notion that the New England soldier was incompetent is false, then the assumed pre-eminence of Canadian-Indian forces and British regulars needs to be re-examined, and it is the purpose of this study to show that the concept of the New Englander as a poor soldier, proven by his performance in the early French wars, is an erroneous impression fostered both by a lack of depth in historical research and by the nature of the warfare itself.

The most obvious erroneous view of provincial soldiers is contained in those opinions of contemporary British officers. They initially articulated the notion that the

---

<sup>17</sup> Steele, Guerrillas and Grenadiers, 132.



New Englanders were poor soldiers, and because they were the only military experts who observed the provincials first hand, their opinion is valued, even if their choice of adjectives is considered caustic. Despite the excessive style, their credentials as experts are rarely challenged. John Shy believed the opinions of British military men would later "have disastrous consequences for them," but he never doubted the truth of their observations. Instead, he proposed a theory that the provincial units the British observed were poor because the disfranchised, the dregs of colonial society, filled their ranks. According to Shy, military service had ceased to be a part of colonial social responsibility, and thus the British did not view the best soldiers America had to offer.<sup>18</sup> Other recent studies concur with this analysis. They attempt to explain why the provincial soldier was so poor and thus seek to justify British observations, instead of suggesting the possibility that the regular officers were wrong, that their prejudices ran so deep they were unable to recognize the truth.<sup>19</sup> Douglas Leach correctly points out that "rarely could a regular officer bring himself to utter words of praise for colonial troops, who, when measured by European professional

---

<sup>18</sup> John Shy, "A New Look at the Colonial Militia," in A People Numerous and Armed: Reflections on the Military Struggle for American Independence (London, 1976), 31.

<sup>19</sup> See Lawrence Delbert Cress, Citizens in Arms: The Army and Militia in American Society to the War of 1812 (Chapel Hill, NC, 1982), and Ferling, A Wilderness of Miseries.

standards, continually seemed to fall far short."<sup>20</sup> Leach also emphasized the aristocratic background of many British officers who viewed provincials as "crude, uncultured, undisciplined, and largely untrained in the science of civilized warfare." Though not all British officers were aristocrats, they were all professionals who "prided themselves on the smartness of their appearance, the quality and uniformity of their accouterments, and the mastery of complex evolutions."<sup>21</sup> When Admiral Peter Warren sent Marine Captain James MacDonald on shore during the siege of Louisbourg in 1745, the New Englanders soon tired of his finicky criticisms of their troops. William Pepperrell wrote "we were glad to get rid of him, for the most he did was to find fault that our encampment was not regular, or that the soldiers did not march as handsome as old regular troops, their toes were not turned enough out, etc."<sup>22</sup>

The observations concerning provincial troops are best placed in context by understanding that most British officers viewed their own troops in the same way. James Wolfe may have referred to provincial soldiers as "the most contemptible cowardly dogs," but when he wrote to his father in 1755, he had the following comments to make about British regulars.

---

<sup>20</sup> Leach, Roots of Conflict, 132.

<sup>21</sup> Leach, Roots of Conflict, 164.

<sup>22</sup> Louis E. D. Forest, Louisbourg Journals: 1745 (New York, 1932), 198.

I have but a very bad opinion of the infantry in general. I know their discipline to be bad, and their valor precarious. They are easily put into disorder, and hard to recover out of it; they frequently kill their Officers through fear, and murder one another in their confusion ... our Method of training and instructing the Troops, is extreamly defective, and tends to no good end; we are lazy in time of Peace and of course want vigilance and activity in War -- our military Education is by far the worst in Europe, and all our concerns are treated with contempt, or totally neglected.<sup>23</sup>

Unfortunately, historians have spent a great deal of time attempting to explain the observations of British officers and government officials, when these opinions are of almost no value in understanding the provincial soldier. The British viewed the world with the unshakeable bigotry of class, nationality and European military experience. Anything outside their vision of the world was suspect and inadequate, and thus only soldiers trained in a European, and preferably British, manner could be considered ideal. When the British government decided to commit British troops to America in the last French war, the extensive role of the

---

<sup>23</sup> J. A. Houlding, Fit For Service: The Training of the British Army, 1715-95 (Oxford, 1981), vii. It may be truly said of men like James Wolfe that they actually have no prejudices -- they hate everyone.

regulars should not be used as an indication of incompetence on the part of colonial soldiers. Once the British army became involved, the provincials were shoved aside, used as laborers or beasts of burden, and this represents only the natural consequences of the deep seated prejudice of British officers.<sup>24</sup>

Some historians have consciously, or unconsciously, adopted this prejudice. Provincial soldiers are compared to their concept of the ideal soldier, a soldier modeled on modern military concepts, but whose origins date back to European standing forces of the eighteenth century, and specifically the army created by George Washington and revolutionary leaders during the War for Independence. The concept is vague, centering on strict discipline and extensive training, but it is the yard stick used to measure all colonial military efforts. According to Lawrence Delbert Cress, militia were "ill prepared for the hardships of camp life and the discipline required for effective military operations." George Washington urged high enlistment bounties which "would provide the long-serving regulars that would ensure the discipline and order necessary for successful military campaigns. ... Soldiering was a demanding craft, argued Washington, requiring skills and training attainable only through long and continuous service."<sup>25</sup>

---

<sup>24</sup> Ferling, A Wilderness of Miseries, 19-20.

<sup>25</sup> Cress, Citizens in Arms, 57.

The inference of a universal ideal for soldiers is plain, although undefined. The bonding of "successful military campaign", "effective military operation" with soldiers "requiring" extensive training and continuous service underscore this notion of the ideal soldier. However, there is no universal ideal soldier, for the concept must also presuppose that all wars and all battle conditions are universal as well. In reality, soldiers are ideal only if their training and motivation are compatible with the kind of war and combat conditions they encounter. Therefore, before condemning the provincial as a poor soldier, historians need to compare him to soldiers fighting a similar enemy under similar conditions, otherwise, like the opinions of those British officers, the comparison is worthless.

But the erroneous impression of New England provincials as poor soldiers originates from far more than a misinterpretation of the notions of British officials. Many historians have underestimated the enormous difficulty in waging war in the New World. The economic strain on the colonies was tremendous and has been well documented by Gary Nash and Douglas Leach. The Quebec expedition of 1690 alone increased the taxes in Massachusetts twenty times the normal rate and forced the first, but by no means the last, issuance of paper currency. Throughout the French wars New England would experience various blows to its economy,

including unremitting inflation and the almost constant depreciation of the currency.<sup>26</sup>

But beyond the overall stress to their economies, provincial governments (and this includes both New France and the English colonies) were hampered by the mercantile policies of their home governments. Colonial status discouraged the development of the industrial support needed by nations waging war in the eighteenth century. Arms, artillery and most of the powder and lead used by provincial forces had to be obtained from England or other sources. British soldiers were no better or no worse than their colonial counterparts, but once the redcoats were committed to the New World they had a plentiful supply of arms, ammunition and, perhaps most important of all, the full support of the British navy. Under these circumstances, success came easier to the British army in the Seven Years War. During the previous four wars, provincial governments had to constantly beg for such logistical and naval support.

Another factor involved in any evaluation of military performance that is not only underestimated, but often ignored entirely, is the element of chance, or if you prefer, the fortunes of war. Historians are uncomfortable with the concept of chance or luck. They fear (and often

---

<sup>26</sup> Gary B. Nash, The Urban Crucible: The Northern Seaports and the Origins of the American Revolution (Abridged Edition, Cambridge, MA, 1986), 36-39, 71; Douglas Leach, Arms for Empire: A Military History of the British Colonies in North America, 1607-1763 (New York, 1973), 270-1.

this fear is justified) that it will lead them into the murky depths of "if only" speculation. If New Englanders failed in most of their major military operations then there has to be a reason which can provide the basis of analysis and comparison, a reason which fits historiographic norms. Samuel Adams Drake concluded that during King William's War "great enterprises had turned to great failures ... not so much from faulty conceptions, as from the want of organization, discipline, command, and of that kind of confidence which comes with them,"<sup>27</sup> and Edward Hamilton believed the expeditions against Montreal and Quebec in 1690 failed because "they were both led by amateurs, capable and well-meaning men but utterly unskilled at warfare, and they were composed of untrained farmers and tradesmen, commanded by inexperienced officers. The French on their side had a great leader, skilled officers and some trained regular troops. It is small wonder that the English were repulsed."<sup>28</sup> The New Englanders failed because they were ignorant, inefficient and undisciplined.

However, the military theorist Carl von Clausewitz wrote "war is the province of chance. In no sphere of human activity is such a margin to be left for this intruder, because none is so much in constant contact with him on all sides. He increases the uncertainty of every circumstance, and deranges the course of events ... all action in war is

---

<sup>27</sup> Drake, The Border Wars of New England, 143.

<sup>28</sup> Hamilton, The French and Indian Wars, 39.

directed on probable, not on certain results. Whatever is wanting in certainty must always be left to fate, or chance, call it what you will."<sup>29</sup> A large part of the failure of the 1690 campaign came from the inability of the forces at Albany to attack Montreal and tie down Frontenac, and from William Phips' delay in arriving at the walls of Quebec with his fleet, a delay which enabled Frontenac to reach the city with heavy reinforcements just as the New England ships were anchoring in the river. But an outbreak of smallpox in the army gathered at Albany partially explains their inability to attack Montreal, and one of the main causes of Phips' delay was the necessity to wait for a ship-load of powder from England. Thus chance (the outbreak of smallpox) and logistics (the powder from England) played major roles in the defeat of provincial forces in their bid to reduce New France. Neither of these reflect negatively on the ability of provincial soldiers, yet the interpretations given above indicate the reason for failure was the inefficiency and lack of professionalism on the part of New England military forces.<sup>30</sup> As Clausewitz correctly observed, "we cannot suppress an inward feeling of satisfaction whenever expectation

---

<sup>29</sup> Carl von Clausewitz, On War (1832, Penguin Books, New York, 1985), first part of the quote is on page 140, the second half on page 227.

<sup>30</sup> Like so many accounts, they seem to concentrate on what happened after Phips arrived at Quebec.



realizes itself, and if it disappoints us our mind is dissatisfied."<sup>31</sup>

While logistics and chance assist us in understanding the reason for some of the reverses suffered by New England in the early French wars, the principal cause of the misconception that provincials were poor soldiers can be attributed to historical methodology and to the peculiar characteristics of the type of warfare involved. It is the concentration on major events, and major disasters, that has given the impression of incompetence. Traditional historical research often duplicates the methods of modern news reporting in that the ordinary escapes detection while the spectacular captures the eye. An air disaster gives the impression that air travel is unsafe because the hundreds of flights each day that take off and arrive without incident do not make headlines. The recitation of disaster in the early French wars (i.e. Quebec 1690, Salmon Falls, York, Pemaquid, Deerfield, Port Royal 1707, and so on) gives the impression of incompetence, but it ignores the constant military service and protection provided by patrols and garrison troops, and the disruption of the Eastern Indians by numerous raids conducted by provincial soldiers. As Richard R. Johnson observed, the emphasis placed on the disasters detracts from the service provided by soldiers on patrol and the string of garrison houses and forts along the frontier. "Such was the pattern of the frontier war, with the enemy battering, and

---

<sup>31</sup> Clausewitz, On War, 227.

occasionally breaking, the links of the chain of the frontier towns but with reinforcements always close at hand and backed by the central government's determination never to abandon a threatened town."<sup>32</sup>

The difficulty in appraising defensive tactics involving guerrilla style warfare is that when the tactics are successful, nothing happens. Although there is evidence that it did occur, it can never be known how many lives were saved, how many towns escaped destruction, by diligent patrols or alert garrisons which discouraged Indian war parties. The Indians left no records, they filed no reports, they granted few interviews. Therefore their successes are magnified because nothing counter-balances the slate.

Dismissing the efforts of provincial soldiers involved in the "*petite guerre*" as "short-term emergency duty" performed by "haphazardly trained and poorly disciplined militia,"<sup>33</sup> historians studying the colonial soldier have concentrated on their involvement in major expeditions such as Quebec in 1690 and 1711, Cartagena or Louisbourg. This superficial examination of the early French wars has encouraged the interpretation that provincial war efforts were inept. But theories based on superficial examination are only valid when supported by deeper analysis. The concen-

---

<sup>32</sup> Richard R. Johnson, Adjustment To Empire: The New England Colonies, 1675-1715 (Rutgers University Press, 1981), 378.

<sup>33</sup> Cress, Citizens in Arms, 8.

tration on the major events ignores the complexity of war on the northern frontier. Like the Sheldon door in Deerfield, emphasis on just the major events rips away the structure and foundation without which the New England military effort loses its reality and its vitality.

This emphasis on the major disasters is also responsible for promoting perhaps the biggest myth of all, that the French were superior in conducting war in the New World. Closer analysis reveals that the tactics of the French and English were remarkably similar and their success rate overall about the same. Both had to defend against that most difficult form of warfare - the surprise guerrilla attack - in which all the advantages as to time and place of the strike lay with the attacker. For New France, their foe was the powerful Iroquois of New York while New England dealt mainly with war parties from the Abenaki tribes in the east. To defend against such surprise attacks, the French and English built fortified houses and forts along the frontier which served as both sanctuary for local inhabitants and as garrisons for soldiers posted there.<sup>34</sup> In addition, the English and French governments organized scouting parties to constantly patrol on the outskirts of these frontier towns, as well as guard the inhabitants at their work. Due to the success of the Abenaki war parties in attacking New England, historians have branded this form

---

<sup>34</sup> W. J. Eccles, Canada Under Louis XIV, 1663-1701 (London, 1964), 157.

of defense as totally inadequate. W. J. Eccles observed that "smaller parties harried the New England frontier continually without the Anglo-American settlers being able to defend it successfully,"<sup>35</sup> yet Francis Parkman indicated the French, employing the same methods, had as much trouble stopping the Iroquois as the English did the Abenaki.<sup>36</sup> In actuality, this method of defense was very effective when used properly, with the understanding that no static defense can totally stop the guerilla surprise attack.

The English and the French realized that the best way to stop the raids was to send their own raiding parties into Indian territory. The American Indian, though terrifying, was essentially a vulnerable adversary. Their numbers were small and their economy fragile. The destruction of their grain supply or the capture of their families or chiefs, could quickly bring about a truce. The French used the same strategy on the English colonies to discourage their expansion east and north, and it was this sort of large offensive raid involving French and Indians which caused the major destruction of towns such as York and Deerfield.

Historians often suggest that New Englanders were incapable of conducting similar raids against Canadian villages. W. J. Eccles believed the English colonies "had no body of men capable of traveling through hundreds of miles of trackless wilderness at any time of the year, let

---

<sup>35</sup> Eccles, The Canadian Frontier, 139.

<sup>36</sup> Parkman, Count Frontenac, 251.

alone in mid-winter, to attack New France."<sup>37</sup> However, the New England colonies throughout the early French wars conducted raids against Abenaki villages deep in New Hampshire and Maine both in summer and in winter. As the majority of Indians used by the French on their raids came from the villages of Norridgewock or Pequawket, it made more sense to attack villages which actually provided the warriors for French raids rather than waste Canadian villages.

The governments of Massachusetts and New Hampshire had to defend a long frontier while mounting offensives against two enemies, the French in Canada and the Eastern Indians. The raids were conducted against the Eastern Indians, but the New Englanders felt the best answer to the French menace was the capture of Canada itself. Therefore, they preferred to put their energies into major expeditions and never seriously considered emulating the French strategy.<sup>38</sup> But here again, W. J. Eccles claims that "the attempts of the English colonies to conquer Canada all ended in failure; several large-scale expeditions had to be abandoned before they made contact with the foe owing to poor organization and general ineptitude. Only part of Acadia, very weakly defended, was lost by the French in all this time."<sup>39</sup>

---

<sup>37</sup> Eccles, The Canadian Frontier, 139.

<sup>38</sup> For the purposes of this study, an expedition is defined as involving artillery and naval support.

<sup>39</sup> Eccles, The Canadian Frontier, 11.

Between 1690 and 1748, New England participated in the planning and execution of nine major expeditions.<sup>40</sup> Of those nine, three were successfully completed, in two the English forces arrived at their destination but were unsuccessful in their attack, and the rest involved cancellation for various reasons. During that same time period, although rarely discussed, the French also contemplated major expeditions against military targets or population centers in New England. One French expedition never passed the planning stage, another had to be cancelled, and two others, designed to recapture Louisbourg and devastate the coast of New England, ended in disaster.<sup>41</sup> Through three wars only one French expedition aimed at the New England colonies accomplished its purpose (the capture of the fort at Pemaquid in 1696). If the failure of major expeditions was caused by poor organization and general ineptitude, there is no indication that this was restricted to the English colonies.

A complete understanding of early American warfare cannot be gained by concentrating on the major events by

---

<sup>40</sup> Port Royal - 1690, Quebec - 1690, Port Royal - 1707, Quebec - 1709, Port Royal - 1710, Quebec - 1711, Louisbourg - 1745, Quebec - 1746, Montreal - 1747

<sup>41</sup> Frontenac planned an invasion of the English colonies in 1690 which never left the planning stage and another such expedition in 1697 was aborted when the French fleet arrived too late. In 1746 a French plan to recapture Louisbourg ended with the sudden demise of its admiral, the suicide of his second-in-command a few days later, and the deaths of 2,400 men from disease, all without firing a shot. During the following year a second attempt was stopped by the British navy.

themselves, the subject is far too complex. War in the New World assumed its own patterns and offered its own set of problems to be overcome by all participants. Through decades of conflict, the New England military system became tuned to the rhythm of frontier war. Juggling a commitment to families, communities and themselves, the New Englanders who performed active duty in the French wars learned and adopted the tactics of the "*petite guerre*" while never losing sight of their ultimate strategic purpose - the reduction of Canada. As in all armies, their ranks included a wide spectrum of ability, they were neither all heroes nor all bunglers. They had to compensate for the curves thrown at them by chance, and, like their Canadian and Indian counterparts, they had to conduct war under enormous handicaps, especially in the area of logistical support (a handicap they would have to overcome again during the War for Independence). Only by examining the total military effort on the northern frontier, only by understanding how war was conducted and experienced, only by restoring the structure and the foundation to the traditional framework, can we hope to present a balanced view of the New England provincial soldier.

**PART I**

**WARFARE ON THE NORTHERN FRONTIER**



## CHAPTER ONE

### THE INITIATION OF WAR

On the evening of Tuesday, September 29, 1691, Henry Dow, member of the committee of militia for the town of Hampton, New Hampshire, wrote a few hasty lines to Major Robert Pike, commander of the militia for the county of Norfolk, to inform him that war, with its twin children death and destruction, had once again come to the coastal communities of New Hampshire. At approximately noon that same day a force of about forty Indians attacked homes on the outskirts of Sandy Beach, burned one or two and killed or carried away at least sixteen people belonging to the Brackitt and Rand families. Messengers had slipped away from the garrisons in Sandy Beach to alert the neighboring towns, including Hampton. However, as two of them were returning to Sandy Beach that evening they saw the Indian party, with canoes over their heads, apparently heading toward Hampton, so they retraced their steps back to that town to raise the alarm. As Hampton prepared to defend itself against this imminent assault, Dow sent a messenger to alert higher authorities concerning the depredations at

Sandy Beach and the "sad condition" of Hampton now threatened by an "inemy so violent."<sup>1</sup>

The messenger sent by Dow reached the home of Robert Pike in Salisbury around eleven that same night. Awakened from his sick bed, Pike added his own post script concerning another attack in Berwick, Maine, resealed the letter, and gave instructions that it be carried to Captain John March. March sent the message to a Captain Mosely, ordering him to forward it to "the Magistrate at Ipswich cort." The magistrate, Nathaniel Saltonstall, awakened "neere to break of day" by the messenger, penned his own post script and forwarded the letter to the "Governor & Councill In Boston Haste post hast." Sometime that morning, Wednesday, September 30, as a party of Hampton men left to succor their neighbors in Sandy Beach,<sup>2</sup> the government of Massachusetts was finally informed that the French and Indian enemy had once again brought war to the northern frontier.<sup>3</sup>

Stretching from the Kennebec River in Maine, through New Hampshire and the Massachusetts counties of Essex and Middlesex, and terminating in the Connecticut River Valley, the Northern frontier of New England in 1689 was a thin line

---

<sup>1</sup> Joseph Dow, History of the Town of Hampton, New Hampshire: From its Settlement in 1638, to the Autumn of 1892 (Salem, MA, 1893 [reprinted, Somerworth, NH, 1970]), 227.

<sup>2</sup> The attack on Hampton never materialized.

<sup>3</sup> James Phinney Baxter, ed. Documentary History of the State of Maine (Portland, ME, 1897), Collections of the Maine Historical Society, 2nd Series, Vol. V, 296-8.

of settlements separating the English colonies from their adversaries to the north and east.<sup>4</sup> War came to this frontier on two levels: the commencement of hostilities between governments or people and the actual intrusion of that war on the local level. The first was formal in nature, it involved the people of Massachusetts and New Hampshire as a whole and lasted several years before peace treaties could be affirmed. The second brought war in a very personal way to communities on the frontier and lasted only a few brutal hours, but both triggered activity or a response from the New England military system.

Normally, New England fought New France as the result of a formal declaration of war between their mother countries in Europe. The notification of such a declaration took about a month to reach the colonies - any longer could possibly leave them unprepared for attack. When William of Orange brought his new kingdom into his quarrel with Louis

---

<sup>4</sup> A list of Massachusetts frontier towns drawn up in 1698 included the following towns: Wells, York, Kittery, Saco in Maine; Salisbury, Amesbury, Haverhill, Andover, Billerica, Chelmsford, Dunstable, Groton, Lancaster, Stow in eastern Massachusetts (With the exception of Dunstable, now Nashua, New Hampshire, this line of towns follows the general line of Interstate 495); and Deerfield, Brookfield, Hatfield, Northampton, Hadley and Westfield in the west. To this list we can add the New Hampshire towns of Dover, Rochester, Durham (Oyster River), Exeter, Portsmouth, Rye (Sandy Beach) and Hampton. By the end of King William's War the frontier had been thrust back in Maine with the abandonment of North Yarmouth and Casco, but during the years of peace these areas would be reoccupied and the frontier pushed out everywhere with the founding of new communities, especially in the period between Dummer's War and King George's war. See Baxter, ed. Doc. Hist. Me., Vol. V, 513.

XIV in May of 1689, Boston did not learn of the declaration of war until the following month, and when war was declared by the government of Queen Anne against France and Spain on May 4, 1702, the news arrived in Boston on June 19.<sup>5</sup> However, notification of the formal commencement of hostilities which would become the War of the Austrian Succession in March, 1744 did not reach Boston for two months, a delay which enabled the French at Louisbourg to launch a surprise attack against the fishing station at Canso.<sup>6</sup>

The formal declaration of war against hostile Indian tribes usually occurred after a gradual buildup of tension between white men and red, even to the point of actual killing. Disputed boundaries between the settlements in Maine and the Eastern Indian tribes came to be the root cause of these conflicts, exacerbated by the greater Anglo-French rivalry. In 1688 the variance centered around North Yarmouth and illustrates the gradual escalation which led to formal declaration of war. Irritated by the plundering of Baron St. Castine's trading post by Governor Sir Edmund Andros, the destruction of crops by cattle and the continued building on disputed lands by the English, the Indians began to kill cattle around North Yarmouth. Judge Benjamin

---

<sup>5</sup> Douglas Edward Leach, Arms For Empire: A Military History of the British Colonies in North America, 1607-1763 (New York, 1973), 81; Samuel Adams Drake, The Border Wars of New England, Commonly called King William's and Queen Anne's Wars (1897, reprint of 1910 edition, Williamstown, MA, 1973), 142.

<sup>6</sup> Leach, Arms for Empire, 224-5.

Blackman took sixteen Indians into custody at Saco to intimidate the tribes from further mischief, but the infuriated Indians seized some English hostages of their own. Governor Andros attempted to quiet the situation by arranging a conference, but the Indians failed to appear. Prompted by the heightened tension, the settlers at North Yarmouth began the construction of several garrison houses. When the Indians abducted a few of the workmen and held them overnight, the people of North Yarmouth asked for the protection of soldiers while they completed the garrisons. In September the Indians snatched two more workmen, and an attempt to free them led to an all day battle in which several were killed on both sides, including one of the leading citizens of North Yarmouth. Further attacks and seizures of English settlers led Andros to issue a proclamation on October 20 demanding the Indians return their prisoners and surrender anyone who had participated in the murder of a white. Although Andros released all Indian prisoners in English custody as a gesture of good will, there was no reply to his proclamation. The Governor raised a force of 700 men and marched into Maine to wage war on the Eastern tribes.<sup>7</sup>

This pattern of a gradual escalation of tension, and even death, before the formal declaration of war would be

---

<sup>7</sup> Cotton Mather, Decennium Luctuosum (1699, reprinted in Charles H. Lincoln, ed., Narratives of the Indian Wars, 1675-1699, New York, 1913), 191; William Hutchison Rowe, Ancient North Yarmouth and Yarmouth, Maine, 1630-1936 (Yarmouth, ME, 1937), 43-50.

repeated in Dummer's War and King George's War.<sup>8</sup> Heightened tensions led the Bay government to send 200 men to Maine to guard the frontier in 1720. During the summer of 1722 there would be two major attacks against Fort St. George in Thomaston, Maine and over fifteen Indians ambushed and killed by the English before Governor Samuel Shute formally declared war on July 25.<sup>9</sup> Over twenty years later, repeated attacks throughout the summer of 1745 would eventually prompt Governor William Shirley to declare war on the Eastern Indians on August 23, two months after the fall of Louisbourg and seventeen months after the declaration of war between England and France.<sup>10</sup> In all these conflicts, the declarations of war against the Indian tribes were separate from the corresponding European struggle and had to be ended by treaties which were similarly distinct from the European peace treaties. Although lumped together as the "French and Indians", the New England colonies actually fought two wars, and two foes, at the same time.<sup>11</sup>

---

<sup>8</sup> Although tensions existed before the start of Queen Anne's War, the commencement of killing and depredations was not gradual but began with a massive attack on all the communities in Maine on August 10, 1703.

<sup>9</sup> Penhallow, Samuel, The History of the Wars of New England with the Eastern Indians (Boston, 1726; Facsimile Reprint, Annotated by Edward Wheelock, Williamstown, MA, 1973), 83-90; Jeremy Belknap, The History of New Hampshire (Reprint of 1831 edition, New York, 1970) Vol 1, 201.

<sup>10</sup> Herbert Milton Sylvester, Indian Wars of New England (Boston, 1910), Vol III, 342.

<sup>11</sup> The two enemies were treated differently as well, see Chapter Twelve for details.

The initiation of war on the local level was neither delayed nor formal, it was sudden and always potentially devastating. Often the notification that war had arrived emanated from the noise of the attack itself - the war cry, musket fire and screams of the victims.<sup>12</sup> On other occasions an all too brief warning alerted inhabitants to the presence of the enemy. Dogs now and then signaled the approach of a foe by barking or growling, as did the dogs kept by the soldiers at Number Four in New Hampshire in 1747 or the McLellan family pet in Gorham, Maine in April, 1746.<sup>13</sup> A garrison in Northampton was similarly alerted to the presence of Indians in May, 1704 by the growling of a canine companion.<sup>14</sup> The strange behavior of other animals could warn of the proximity of enemy raiding parties. In May of 1690 the suspicions of the people of Falmouth, Maine were correctly aroused when they observed the cattle staring at the woods, refusing to go near the fence that lined the field.<sup>15</sup> The warning a Captain Jones of Oyster River, New Hampshire received was more explicit and abrupt. Thinking the barking of his dogs might be caused by the presence of wolves, Jones sat on a flanker at his garrison one evening in July, 1694. As he surveyed the surrounding woods his eye

---

<sup>12</sup> Baxter, ed. Doc. Hist. Me., Vol. V, 57.

<sup>13</sup> Sylvester, Indian Wars of New England, Vol. III, 380-2; Hugh D. McLellan, History of Gorham, Maine (Portland, ME, 1903), 49.

<sup>14</sup> Penhallow, History of the Wars, 15.

<sup>15</sup> Mather, Decennium Luctuosum, 219.

caught the flash of powder from the pan of a musket in the woods, and he instinctively threw himself backward just as the ball struck the spot where he had been sitting.<sup>16</sup>

Warning or not, once an attack began it was necessary to alert other members of the community to their danger and also notify neighboring towns. Again, sometimes the notification came from the noise of the attack itself, the sound of firing or an ominous cloud of smoke usually indicated that the enemy had struck again. Francis Hooke of Kittery heard the sound of firing toward York during the attack on that town in 1692,<sup>17</sup> and Charles Frost reported that Wells was alarmed "by the shotting of Many guns in the woods nere the garisons" in September of 1695.<sup>18</sup> Three years earlier reports circulated that Wells had been destroyed due to the volume of smoke seen over the village, but the residents had only been burning brush to prevent ambush.<sup>19</sup> In 1642 Massachusetts Bay stipulated the method of notification should be the firing of three muskets, sending a messenger, beating a drum, or firing a cannon. Later the law would be amended with the addition of a burning beacon and increasing the first method to four muskets. New Hampshire passed similar laws calling for the firing of four muskets, a

---

<sup>16</sup> Belknap, History of New Hampshire, 138.

<sup>17</sup> Baxter, ed. Doc. Hist. Me., Vol. V, 310.

<sup>18</sup> Baxter, ed. Doc. Hist. Me., Vol. V, 429.

<sup>19</sup> "Letter from Samuel Sewell, Boston, July 11, 1692," American Antiquarian Society, Curwen Family Papers, Box 51, folder 44



cannon and two muskets or the beating of drums. To prevent the spreading of false alarms, statutes prohibited the firing of muskets after dark, the offense carrying a penalty of 20 shilling fine or two hours in the stocks.<sup>20</sup>

The presence of a cannon in frontier communities, usually in the form of a swivel gun, was more for signaling in case of attack than defense. As the French wars began, signal cannon had been used to report a variety of activities and thus its report could cause momentary confusion. John Gyles remembered that when the men in the fields heard the report of the signal gun at the start of the Indian raid on Pemaquid in 1689, his father hoped the sound meant the arrival of a ship bearing good news, a hope immediately shattered by the volley of forty muskets.<sup>21</sup> As King William's War progressed the sound of a cannon shot came to mean one thing, the presence of the enemy and the need to gain the safety of fort or garrison. The Fort at Gorham, Maine had two swivels which were fired to alert both residents and soldiers at Falmouth of the attack on April 17, 1746.<sup>22</sup> In one incident the deliberate firing of a false alarm saved the lives of some stubborn women in Exeter, New Hampshire who insisted on picking strawberries

---

<sup>20</sup> Background of Selective Service (Washington, 1947), Vol II, Massachusetts Militia Laws, 17, 19; New Hampshire Militia Laws laws, 15.

<sup>21</sup> Drake, Border Wars of New England, 30-1.

<sup>22</sup> McClellan, History of Gorham, Maine, 44; Sylvester, Indian Wars of New England, 351-4.

in the woods. Their frustrated husbands and fathers in the garrison fired the signal cannon to scare them into returning, but later it was discovered Indians had been waiting to ambush the party of berry pickers when the sound of the signal gun scared them off as well.<sup>23</sup>

The sound of the signal cannon, musket fire or the beating of drums served both as a signal of immediate danger to inhabitants and as a distress call to neighboring communities. Those neighboring towns would beat the drum and fire their cannon to alert other towns and assemble a force to aid the beleaguered community. Francis Hooke in Kittery wrote of "allarams round about us" in 1691,<sup>24</sup> and the distant roll of drums and trumpets probably saved Haverhill from complete devastation in 1708 when an enemy force, hearing that the countryside was aroused, hastily withdrew.<sup>25</sup> Lancaster was similarly saved in July, 1704.<sup>26</sup>

The most common method of assuring the notification of other towns, not to mention higher provincial authorities, was to send a messenger, a method obviously hazardous to the individuals volunteering to leave the safety of a garrison and travel through the woods known to be full of Indians. One such messenger, William Plaisted, "made his Escape from Captain Wincols house which was twice assaulted by the Enemy

---

<sup>23</sup> Mather, Decennium Luctuosum, 267-8.

<sup>24</sup> Baxter, ed. Doc. Hist. Me., Vol. V, 288.

<sup>25</sup> Drake, Border Wars of New England, 242-3.

<sup>26</sup> Drake, Border Wars of New England, 205-6.

but they were beaten [off] by six or seaven English men whome he left in possession of said house when he came away from thence to give this advise [concerning the attack on Salmon Falls]."<sup>27</sup> Cotton Mather recounted the story of Ebenezer Babson of Gloucester which provides a vivid illustration of the hazards of being such a messenger. "Bapson went, to carry the news [of enemy activity] to the Harbour; and being about Half a mile in his way thither, he heard a Gun go off, and heard a Bullet whiss close by his Ear, which Cut off a Pine bush just by him, and the Bullet lodg'd in an Hemlock-tree. Then looking about, he saw Four men Running towards him ... so he ran into the bushes, and turning about, shot at them, and then ran away and saw them no more."<sup>28</sup> Though hazardous, the messenger system remained an important method of alarm and a vital source of intelligence which enabled the New England military authorities to form the proper response.

In responding to war, whether a formal declaration or an actual attack, New England governments drew on their inhabitants to perform as soldiers. With the exception of the few Indian forces raised, there was no thought of hiring foreign mercenaries to fight New England's wars, the well-documented English aversion to standing troops precluded that option and there was little money to do so anyway. If London would not protect the colonies with professional

---

<sup>27</sup> Baxter, ed. Doc. Hist. Me., Vol. V, 51.

<sup>28</sup> Mather, Decennium Luctuosum, 243-7.

soldiers, New Englanders would have to perform that function, and it was the militia system which enabled the colonial governments to put together the military forces necessary to respond to war.

The role of the New England militia in the colonial wars as been the subject of some controversy among historians. The most prevalent interpretation, in its most cynical form, depicts the militia as selfish citizens who mouthed platitudes for defense but against standing armies, then when actual duty called, forced those outside the mainstream of the community into service. They were men who craftily constructed laws which exempted the privileged from duty and excluded the "have-nots" in their society from participation in the militia, then passed legislation which prohibited the use of that militia outside the colony, thereby guaranteeing they would not have to fight.<sup>29</sup> Thus by the "last quarter of the seventeenth century," according to Lawrence Delbert Cress, "the militia had ceased to be the principal military arm of the colonies."<sup>30</sup> The militia had not disappeared, but it had all but lost its military significance and had become an organizational unit, a local

---

<sup>29</sup> Leach, Arms for Empire, 8-9; Howard H. Peckham, The Colonial Wars, 1689-1762 (Chicago, 1964), 26; "An Act for the Regulating of the Militia, May 14, 1718," New Hampshire Laws, Background of Selective Service, 53; "An Act for Regulating the Militia, Nov. 22, 1693," Massachusetts Militia Laws, Background of Selective Service, 140.

<sup>30</sup> Lawrence Delbert Cress, Citizens in Arms: The Army and Militia in American Society to the War of 1812 (Chapel Hill, NC, 1982), 5.

draft board seeking out the "have-nots" in the community to ship out to the frontier or on expeditions to Canada.<sup>31</sup>

However, it is questionable if the New England militia, as constituted by law, was ever intended to fulfill an actual combat role. In order to satisfy the declension theory, the passive role of the New England militia in the eighteenth century must be preceded by an active phase in the previous century, and vague references to militia companies and even regiments performing active duty do appear. John E. Ferling indicated that "militia companies were utilized on occasion in offensive operations against both Indian and European foes",<sup>32</sup> and Douglas Leach, in his excellent work, Arms For Empire: A Military History of the British Colonies in North America, 1607-1763, stated that "in case of sudden threat to a local area, such as an Indian raid or an invasion of pirates, the militia in that vicinity might be called up *in toto*, and would go into action just as constituted."<sup>33</sup>

---

<sup>31</sup> Cress, Citizens in Arms, 5, 13. See also Richard R. Johnson, Adjustment To Empire: The New England Colonies, 1675-1715 (Rutgers University Press, 1981), 377; James Kirby Martin and Mark Edward Lender, A Respectable Army: The Military Origins of the Republic, 1763-1789 (Arlington Heights, IL, 1982), 20; John Shy, "A New Look at the Colonial Militia" in A People Numerous and Armed: Reflections on the Military Struggle for American Independence (London, 1976), 30-1.

<sup>32</sup> John Ferling, A Wilderness of Miseries: War and Warriors in Early America (Westport, CN, 1980), 16.

<sup>33</sup> Leach, Arms for Empire, 21.

The militia did not cease to be the principle military arm of the New England colonies by the late seventeenth century because it had never served in that capacity, the militia could not lose military significance it never possessed. The New England militia companies, as conceived by legislation, were never used for active duty for that would have stripped communities of every able-bodied man capable of defending the town and supporting the local economy.<sup>34</sup> Even the earliest military operations in Massachusetts, the various exploits of Myles Standish, the Block Island expedition and the Pequot War were undertaken by volunteers or pressed men from the communities of Plymouth or the Bay Colony, not militia companies themselves.<sup>35</sup>

As the militia was not used for active service, the laws prohibiting their employment outside the colony were purely political in nature. The Massachusetts Charter of 1693 gave the governor "full power by himself or by any Chief Commander ... appointed by him from time to time to ... assemble in Martiall Array and put in Warlike posture the Inhabitants of Our said Province ... and to lead and

---

<sup>34</sup> According to Darrett B. Rutman "the reorganized militia was not an offensive weapon, for to call it up and dispatch it out of the Bay would have been to deplete the colony of every adult capable of carrying a musket or wielding a sword." See Darrett B. Rutman, A Militant New World, 1607-40 (New York, 1979), 679.

<sup>35</sup> Rutman, A Militant New World, 686; Leach, Arms for Empire, 45-46; Alden T. Vaughn, New England Frontier: Puritans and Indians, 1620-1675 (Boston, 1965), 71-89.

Conduct them and with them to Encounter Expulse Repell Resist and pursue by force of Armes ... within or without the limitts of Our said Province." Of course the Act further stated that the governor could not send soldiers "out of the Limitts of the [province] without their Free and voluntary consent or the Consent of the Great and Generall Court or Assembly of Our said Province,"<sup>36</sup> but the Massachusetts Assembly regularly gave its governors virtual *carte blanche* to transport or send its soldiers "to the relief of the neighboring provinces or colonies" while the Assembly was between sessions.<sup>37</sup> In effect, the provincial forces "detached out of the militia" with their own government appointed officers in command were sent pretty much wherever provincial authorities desired.<sup>38</sup>

The rare occasions when this statute was invoked usually involved political jealousies between colonies or internal disruption that extended beyond the military emergency. After the destruction of Oyster River in July, 1694, Lt-Governor John Usher of New Hampshire appealed to the government of Massachusetts three times in two weeks for troops. Governor William Phips, who was technically governor of New Hampshire as well, replied to the first request

---

<sup>36</sup> "The Charter of the Province of the Massachusetts-Bay" in Massachusetts Militia Laws, Background of Selective Service, 137. The emphasis is mine.

<sup>37</sup> Acts and Resolves of the Province of Massachusetts Bay, 1692-1714 (Boston, 1869).

<sup>38</sup> Baxter, ed. Doc. Hist. Me., Vol. V, 117; Mather, Decennium Luctuosum, 218.

by invoking that section of the law which prevented the sending of militia beyond the border. "I cannot order," he wrote on July 19, "the detaching or impressing men to serve in your province."<sup>39</sup> Phips, mired in the political controversy which soon led to his recall to England, was not overly concerned with the fate of his northern colony, and thus the statute provided him an excuse to ignore Usher's appeal. Three days after Phips' reply to Usher, Lt-Governor William Stoughton informed the government of New Hampshire that one hundred men would be sent to their relief, although he later insisted New Hampshire pay at least part of the expenses. The one hundred men were not easily raised, however, but not because of English militia traditions and colonial laws. Relating part of a conversation he had with Stoughton in October, Usher told the New Hampshire Council that "many [Massachusetts] soldiers whoe had been in the Province to serve itt, were very ill treated; the Which I am altogether ignorant of."<sup>40</sup>

The ill treatment apparently referred to the men from Newbury who had eagerly volunteered to chase the Indian raiding party which had devastated Dover, New Hampshire, in 1689. During that service their impressions of the inhabitants of New Hampshire, and the fact they were forced to

---

<sup>39</sup> Nathaniel Bouton, ed., Documents and Records Relating to the Province of New Hampshire (Manchester, NH, 1869) New Hampshire Provincial and State Papers, Vol II, 124-5.

<sup>40</sup> Bouton, ed., NHSP, Vol II, 135.



stay longer than they planned, left an unfavorable mark.<sup>41</sup> In the midst of that crisis in the summer of 1694, Usher received a letter from the town of Newbury indicating there were few men willing to volunteer for service in New Hampshire.<sup>42</sup>

Throughout the early French wars Massachusetts scouting parties regularly went into the mountain and lake region of New Hampshire, and pursuit forces from New Hampshire frequently succored their neighbors in Maine without any thought to statutory limitations. The crisis in the summer of 1694 is one of the few instances where that section of the militia law prohibiting the use of the militia outside the colony was employed, and the reasons did not involve institutional theory and tradition, but politics and pique.

Although not meant for active service, the New England militia served two important functions - they provided administration, or a military bureaucracy, for the provincial governments, and they furnished a defensive structure for their local communities. The administrative function of the militia actually mirrored the regimental system within the British army during the late seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. Like the New England militia, British regiments consisted of companies which were commanded by captains and

---

<sup>41</sup> James Phinney Baxter, ed., Documentary History of the State of Maine, (Portland, ME, 1907), Collections of the Maine Historical Society, 2nd Series, Vol. IX, 2, 13.

<sup>42</sup> Bouton, ed., NHSP, Vol II, 127.

lieutenants. But the regiment and its companies served only an administrative purpose. They enabled the British government to survey their men through company rolls, to issue uniforms, arms, ammunition, food, and to dispense the meager pay. For the purposes of combat, the "regiment" became a "battalion" (or two or three battalions depending on the size of the regiment), and the men distributed into equal firing platoons, sub-divisions and grand-divisions, each commanded by the captains and lieutenants and all without regard for the original composition of the administrative units called companies.<sup>43</sup>

As the "regiment" and the "company" provided for administration within the British army, and not a tactical or combat role, so the New England militia provided an administrative capability for the governments of Massachusetts and New Hampshire. In the words of Morrison Sharp, the duties of militia officers "were limited to drilling their men, keeping their muster rolls, and inspecting the home-stored supplies of powder, lead and guns."<sup>44</sup> As members of the local committees of militia,<sup>45</sup>

---

<sup>43</sup> J. A. Houlding, Fit For Service: The Training of the British Army, 1715-95 (Oxford, 1981), 90-94. When the British adopted alternate fire and abandoned platoon fire by the end of the eighteenth century, the companies were kept intact as firing units, although their officers, especially captains, still commanded sub-divisions (in this case two companies) instead of just their company, and the regiment was still considered a battalion for tactical purposes.

<sup>44</sup> Sharp, Morrison, "Leadership and Democracy in the Early New England System of Defense," American Historical

they also supervised the collection and distribution of supplies - food and clothing - within the community.<sup>46</sup>

Closely related to the administrative role, the second function of the militia, especially for the officers, was to prepare the community for its own defense. The supervision of arms, ammunition and supplies played a part here, but responsibilities also included keeping garrisons in repair, providing for watches and wards, and preparing an alarm list of members of the militia to pursue enemy raiding parties or aid neighboring communities.<sup>47</sup> Although the tactical role of the militia in the defense of their towns has been emphasized by some historians, during actual attacks there was little semblance between the militia as delineated by statute and the community fighting for survival. The control of a militia officer extended only over those who managed to get into his garrison, and there was little time for the legalities concerning membership in the militia, the list and exemptions which have so enamored social

---

Review, 5 (1945), 245; Drake, Border Wars of New England, 144.

<sup>45</sup> The committees of militia in New England towns consisted of the local magistrate and all the leading officers of the militia (for example, the captain of every foot company and troop of cavalry were members), with a working quorum being three - Massachusetts Militia Laws, Background of Selective Service, 52.

<sup>46</sup> See Chapter Two.

<sup>47</sup> John R. Galvin, The Minute Men: A Compact History of the Defenders of the American Colonies, 1645-1775 (New York, 1967), 29. Galvin believed the willingness of communities to support each other in time of danger fostered a fraternal spirit among New England towns.

historians. During an Indian raid everyone - the privileged, the militiaman, the "have-nots", and even women and children - became soldiers to a certain extent.

In his article "Persistent Localism: English Social Change and the Shaping of New England Institutions," Timothy Breen has correctly emphasized the parochial nature of the militia. "The colonial government could dispatch an army against the Indians, but the militia itself was a local institution." Breen compared the militia with Congregational churches and town government. "All of them stressed local control, even if that meant an unprecedented degree of popular participation in the selection of the leaders." Reacting to the political and social disruption in England caused by the crown appointed militia officers, "the immigrants ... restored the trainbands to community control. Once the militia had been transformed into a local structure, it became highly unlikely that it could be used to oppress the settlers."<sup>48</sup>

The militia of northern New England, then, was what Fred Anderson called a combination "Home Guard, draft board

---

<sup>48</sup> Timothy Breen, "Persistent Localism: English Social Change and the Shaping of New England Institutions," William and Mary Quarterly, 3rd Series, 32 (1975), 22-23. Political control through localism apparently worked, according to Breen. "A survey of Massachusetts records reveals no instance in which the colony's rulers attempted to employ the militia as a police force, as a tax collector, or as an instrument of social control."

and supply network."<sup>49</sup> Despite the attempts of John K. Mahon to devise the categories "standing militia", "volunteer militia" and "war volunteers" for military service,<sup>50</sup> only two general groupings were recognized in New England during war - soldier and inhabitant. Every man who volunteered or was pressed for active military service, every man "in His Majesty's pay", was a provincial soldier. Everyone else was an inhabitant, including members of militia companies who might be involved in local scouting, or involved with alarm lists and the pursuit of the enemy. Indeed, it could be argued that even in these circumstances men came under the control of the provincial government. As early as 1630, all soldiers in Plymouth wounded in action became the responsibility of the province, not the local community,<sup>51</sup> and those inhabitants pursuing Indian raiding parties were rewarded by the provincial government for any Indians killed.<sup>52</sup>

It was the militia officers and committees within the towns who organized the inhabitants, and they exercised a great deal of control over their communities, including who

---

<sup>49</sup> Fred Anderson, A People's Army: Massachusetts Soldiers and Society in the Seven Years War (Chapel Hill, NC, 1984), 27.

<sup>50</sup> Mahon, History of the Militia, 5. Standing militia - according to law; Volunteer militia - volunteered for particular duties; War Volunteers - volunteered for extensive period, or for service beyond colonial or state boundaries.

<sup>51</sup> Rutman, A Militant New World, 405.

<sup>52</sup> Penhallow, History of the Wars, 39.

would become a soldier if sufficient volunteers were not found, garrison assignments, and even economic decisions concerning the tilling of fields and the impressment of cattle and other supplies. When soldiers were stationed in frontier towns, this led to an overlapping of jurisdiction which can be difficult to understand. For example, soldiers assigned to garrisons were under the orders of the garrison owners, who were often militia officers, as well as their provincial commanders, who may or may not be present.<sup>53</sup> But provincial officers took precedence over the militia in all military concerns. The Bay government ordered all "sheriffs, Marshals, Constables and other officers, military and civil" to aid Benjamin Church in his 1689 raid into Maine.<sup>54</sup> When the province of New Hampshire authorized Captain Nathaniel Mesharvy to "beat his drums" in a regiment of militia for volunteers to take Louisbourg, they commanded the "Colonel, with the other Officers in the said Regiment ... not to give the said Nathaniel Mesharvy any Obstruction or Molestation herein, but on the Contrary to Afford him all the necessary

---

<sup>53</sup> When King and March returned from their raid into Maine in 1691, they were released from service, but ordered to leave their soldiers then in garrisons "in their several posts under the care of their Inferior Officers with the advise and assistance of the chiefe Officer of the respective places whereto they are assigned." The arrangement caused a "great murmering among the soldiers" See Baxter, ed. Doc. Hist. Me., Vol. V, 292; See Chapter Two for further details on garrisons.

<sup>54</sup> Thomas Church, The History of the Great Indian War of 1675 and 1676 Commonly called Philip's War, also, The Old French and Indian Wars, from 1689 to 1704 (Hartford, Conn, 1845 edition, orig. pub. 1716), 155.

encouragement and Assistance."<sup>55</sup> Provincial officers carefully preserved this distinction and separation, and statutes exempted "all such as have had commissions, and served as field officers" from militia training.<sup>56</sup>

Administrative duties and the overlapping jurisdictions could produce an adversary relationship between militia leaders and provincial officers. Colonel Thomas Westbrook, provincial commander in Maine during Dummer's War, had several problems and confrontations with community leaders. "I proposed to some of the Commission officers of the Militia," wrote Westbrook in April, 1724, "that when our Scouts are lodged, that they rally together the Inhabitants, and that with the remainder of the Soldiers and part of them they range the woods on the backs of the Towns.... but I have received no Answer from them."<sup>57</sup> A few days later an obviously frustrated Westbrook sent the following to Lt-Governor William Dummer. "The Enclosed is a Coppy of an Impertinent Letter from Mr Peter Nowell, Representative of York, which I am almost ashamed to trouble your Honour with, neither should I have presumed to have done it had it not

---

<sup>55</sup> Isaac Hammond, ed., Miscellaneous Provincial and State Papers (Manchester, NH, 1890) New Hampshire Provincial and State Papers, Vol XVIII, 215.

<sup>56</sup> "An Act for the Regulating of the Militia, May 14, 1718," New Hampshire Laws, Background of Selective Service, 53; "An Act for Regulating the Militia, Nov. 22, 1693," Massachusetts Militia Laws, Background of Selective Service, 140.

<sup>57</sup> William Blake Trask, Letters of Colonel Thomas Westbrook and others Relative to Indian Affairs in Maine. 1722-1726, (Boston, 1901), 53.

seemed to have reflected on your Honour, he asserting that your Honour promised the men should be dismissed in Convenient time to help to put their seed into the ground. His daily declaring he has brought a presumed dismissal for the men has Created a great deal of uneasiness among the people."<sup>58</sup>

One area in particular that irritated provincial commanders was the frequent inability of militia officers to force their communities to observe elementary defense precautions. When Westbrook consulted with the militia officers and town officials of Biddeford, Maine, they admitted they had not followed the government's instructions concerning defense measures.<sup>59</sup> On another occasion, he informed Dummer that his "advise to the Inhabitants and orders to the officers has always been not to go out with less then fifteen or eighteen men or more as the occasion may require but the inhabitants are so obstinate they will go out not above two or three at a time two or three miles from their garrisons if they cannot all have a guard in one day and the Officers of the Militia in each town do not take any care to regulate them, they refuse to help in watching in their garrisons at night where soldiers are ... especially the inhabitants at Perpooduck point I acquainted them it was your Honors orders but they refused to comply.

---

<sup>58</sup> Trask, Letters of Colonel Thomas Westbrook, 55.

<sup>59</sup> Trask, Letters of Colonel Thomas Westbrook, 18.



There lies this difficulty with me which I can't tell how to get over."<sup>60</sup>

Much has been written about the process of electing militia officers,<sup>61</sup> both from the viewpoint of identifying the roots of American democracy and as evidence of inefficiency and lack of military professionalism,<sup>62</sup> but the selection of militia officers, and town militia committees, was both crucial and controversial due to the definition of their function in the community. The militia officers and committee members decided whose cattle would be confiscated for the war effort, who would be pressed as a soldier, and when homes and crops would be abandoned for the discomfort of garrison living. These decisions affected the economic well-being, and even the lives of the inhabitants of the frontier communities, and thus the social standing, and the political and religious affiliations of these men were an important consideration if their orders were to be

---

<sup>60</sup> James Phinney Baxter, ed., Documentary History of the State of Maine, (Portland, ME, 1907), Collections of the Maine Historical Society, 2nd Series, Vol. X, 216.

<sup>61</sup> Actually, the freemen of the town elected men for their nomination as captain, lieutenant or ensign, and these nominations were sent to the government, who had final approval. Militia companies had to number at least sixty-four men before they could vote for officers with the smaller companies being amalgamated by the regimental major in order that they may also choose officers. See Massachusetts Militia Laws, Background of Selective Service, 85-86.

<sup>62</sup> Sharp, "Leadership and Democracy," AHR, 5 (1945); Breen, "Persistent Localism," WMQ, 3rd Series, 32 (1975).

followed.<sup>63</sup> During the best of times, when no immediate danger threatened, militia officers had difficulties prodding their fellow citizens to observe precautions, but if any political or religious dissension split the community, the selection of militia officers and the establishment of militia committees became difficult, if not impossible. In such cases it was often necessary for the provincial government to step in and decide on candidates.

In particular, the provincial officers sent to the eastern frontier at the start of King William's War found the communities torn apart by political faction resulting from the Glorious Revolution, and the militia in disarray. Sylvanus Davis, commanding Fort Loyal in Falmouth, Maine asked the government in July of 1689 for someone to regulate the militia of the town to control the inhabitants.<sup>64</sup> At the same time, Jeremiah Swain found the people of Berwick "in as much Danger of Some among them as of the Enemy for

---

<sup>63</sup> James Kirby Martin and Mark Edward Lender reiterated a common observation about the constitution of militia companies. "What has been forgotten is that militia law by the early eighteenth century rather systematically excluded the indigents and the unprivileged (a mushrooming proportion of the population by the 1750s) from service." If militia companies did exclude non-property holders from their rolls, and this trend involves the slave owning southern colonies more than New England, it was because the decisions made by militia officers, including confiscation and abandonment, directly concerned the owners of property. Therefore they wanted only the owners of property selecting those officers. It was not a conspiracy to separate the poor from the community to make it easier to draft them for service at far away forts. See Martin and Lender, A Respectable Army, 18.

<sup>64</sup> Baxter, ed. Doc. Hist. Me., Vol. IX, 14.

want of a well Settlement of the Militia." Swain met with the leading men in the community, as well as some from New Hampshire just across the river, got them to agree on the placement of garrisons and appointed commanders over the militia, but "not without great Opposition by some."<sup>65</sup> When Swain was ordered to dissolve his command the following November, he informed the government he had left a provincial officer in charge of the area. Although he had urged that some of the local officers take control of defense measures, he was told the local government "was so lame that they could scarce command each man his family", and it would be the undoing of the frontier not to leave one of the provincial officers in charge because the soldiers in garrison and the inhabitants feared the Bay government more than they did their own officers.<sup>66</sup>

Despite frustration and animosity between provincial soldiers and inhabitants, one area where they usually managed complete cooperation was in the initial response to an attack - pursuit of the enemy. As an almost instinctive reaction, pursuit of enemy raiding parties was an attempt to rescue captives and punish the perpetrators, and it could involve inhabitants, provincial soldiers or a combination of both.<sup>67</sup> The inhabitants in this case were usually members

---

<sup>65</sup> Baxter, ed. Doc. Hist. Me., Vol. IX, 57.

<sup>66</sup> Baxter, ed. Doc. Hist. Me., Vol. IX, 76.

<sup>67</sup> Baxter, ed. Doc. Hist. Me., Vol. IX, 2; "Letter dated September 1, 1696," AAS, Mass. Collections, 1629-1869; Baxter, ed. Doc. Hist. Me., Vol. V, 51.

of an alarm list established by the local militia, constituting up to thirty per cent of the total militia rolls. Ordered to be ready at a half hour's notice, they either conducted the pursuit themselves, or joined with soldiers operating in the area.<sup>68</sup> Part of provincial officer Simon Willard's instructions in 1689 commanded that "upon notice of the Enemyes approach to make out a party or partys against them if by the advice of your Officers, and the Officers and cheife persons of the place with the assistance of the Inhabitants it shall be judged you have a sufficient strength to issue forth against them."<sup>69</sup> In November, 1711, when three Indians and a Frenchman stole a fishing sloop, Ensign William Hilton and four others from York joined with a sergeant and eight soldiers from the garrison and sailed in pursuit, recaptured the sloop and executed the thieves.<sup>70</sup> In 1746 the Reverend Thomas Smith found his congregation in Falmouth, Maine sparse one Sunday because so many men were chasing an Indian.<sup>71</sup> During the previous Spring, a Sergeant Trott and nine soldiers were joined by twelve inhabitants to chase a party of Indians who had killed a man near North Yarmouth. Trott had to call off the pursuit when the inhabitants ran out of provisions. The next day twenty-six more

---

<sup>68</sup> Galvin, The Minute Men, 22.

<sup>69</sup> Baxter, ed. Doc. Hist. Me., Vol. V, 13.

<sup>70</sup> Charles Edward Banks, History of York, Maine (Boston, 1931-35), Vol. I, 318.

<sup>71</sup> Journals of the Rev. Thomas Smith and the Rev. Samuel Deane (Portland, ME, 1849), 124.

local men joined the force and they tracked the raiding party for several miles, finding many traces of the enemy, but once again, as Trott recorded in his journal, "the inhabitants that went with us having no provision would go no further."<sup>72</sup>

Often such pursuit accomplished nothing, the Indians slipped away leaving very little trace.<sup>73</sup> Captain James Converse pursued one raiding party for three days without success.<sup>74</sup> In addition, the risks involved in pursuit were great as the pursuers themselves could become victims by running into an ambush. The 140 men who pursued the raiding party which struck Salmon Falls in 1690 ran into an ambush at a river crossing just north of Berwick, Maine. A sharp fight ensued in which four or five English and two Frenchmen were killed, and one Frenchman captured.<sup>75</sup> The pursuers chasing the enemy force which had devastated Deerfield in 1704 ran into an ambush and were driven back to Deerfield in a running fight with the loss of nine dead.<sup>76</sup>

The most famous ambush, as recounted by Jeremy Belknap, occurred in what is now Nashua, New Hampshire in September,

---

<sup>72</sup> Rowe, Ancient North Yarmouth, 98.

<sup>73</sup> Belknap, The History of New Hampshire, 131; Mather, Decennium Luctuosum, 269-70; Drake, Border Wars of New England, 189; Sylvester, Indian Wars of New England, Vol III, 359.

<sup>74</sup> Mather, Decennium Luctuosum, 221

<sup>75</sup> Belknap, The History of New Hampshire, 132.

<sup>76</sup> Drake, Border Wars of New England, 182-3.

1724. When two men who were making turpentine failed to return in the evening, "a party consisting of ten of the principal inhabitants of the place started in search of them, under the direction of one French, a sergeant of militia. In this company was Joseph Farwell, who was the next year lieutenant under [John] Lovewell." From signs at the work site, they concluded the men had been taken by Indians only a short time before, and so decided to pursue immediately. "Farwell advised them to take a circuitous rout, to avoid an ambush. But unfortunately he and French had a short time previous had a misunderstanding and were then at variance. French imputed this advice to cowardice, and called out, 'I am going to take the direct path; if any of you are not afraid, let him follow me.' French led the way and the whole party followed, Farwell falling in the rear." Firing from ambush at a brook crossing, the Indians killed most of the men instantly, then overtook and destroyed the rest as they tried to flee, all except Farwell, who led them a merry chase until he plunged into a thicket and eluded them.<sup>77</sup>

Another danger in pursuit was the risk to the captives who might be put to death if their would be rescuers got too close.<sup>78</sup> In 1695 nine captives from Newbury, Massachusetts, were clubbed by their captors when a pursuit force caught up

---

<sup>77</sup> Belknap, The History of New Hampshire, 207.

<sup>78</sup> Baxter, ed. Doc. Hist. Me., Vol. IX, 9; Abijah P. Marvin, History of the Town of Lancaster (Lancaster, MA, 1879), 146.

with them.<sup>79</sup> One of the four children taken from Cape Neddick, Maine in 1705 was executed in revenge when pursuers shot one of the raiding party,<sup>80</sup> as was another captive two years later when a pursuit party engaged the raiders so closely the Indians were forced to leave their packs behind which "so exasperated their spirits".<sup>81</sup>

With the constant threat of ambush and the very real danger to captives, it may appear to have been counter-productive to continue pursuit activities. But the records indicate that the rescue of captives, or punishment inflicted on raiders, occurred frequently enough to encourage pursuit, especially with the added incentive of financial reward for enemy killed.<sup>82</sup> In 1692, pursuers chasing a raiding party that had struck Brookfield, Massachusetts trapped the Indians in a swamp, killed most of them and recovered all captives and plunder.<sup>83</sup> In June, 1696, a pursuit force from Dover, New Hampshire found the Indian raiding party which had just struck Portsmouth Plain cooking breakfast on a hill in what is now the town of Rye. The captives were between the Indians and the top of the hill, so the rescuers charged from the reverse slope, released the

---

<sup>79</sup> Mather, Decennium Luctuosum, 260. Cotton Mather reported that all died within a year except one boy who had been hit in the shoulder, not the head.

<sup>80</sup> Penhallow, The History of the Wars, 32.

<sup>81</sup> Penhallow, The History of the Wars, 44.

<sup>82</sup> Penhallow, The History of the Wars, 39.

<sup>83</sup> Drake, Border Wars of New England, 86.

captives and drove the Indians into a swamp, recapturing all their plunder.<sup>84</sup> In 1698 two boys taken from Hatfield were rescued when pursuers fired on the raiders' canoes as they made their way down the Connecticut river,<sup>85</sup> and in 1704 eight Haverhill residents were rescued from captivity by pursuers.<sup>86</sup> Two years later a rescue force from Dover, New Hampshire reclaimed three of five children taken by an Indian raiding party, then continued the pursuit so vigorously, the Indians left the other two captives, their plunder and blankets in their haste to escape.<sup>87</sup>

Numerous other examples could be given to illustrate the reason pursuits were undertaken despite the risks.<sup>88</sup> More than anything else, pursuit was an impulsive, emotional reaction to the intrusion of war on local communities. It fulfilled a need to strike back, to undo the hurt, and to save their neighbors from the anguish of captivity. The cooperation between inhabitants and provincial forces involved in pursuit underscores the emotional involvement.

---

<sup>84</sup> Dow, History of the Town of Hampton, 229; Drake, Border Wars of New England, 109. Drake felt the Indians could have been destroyed as well if the attack had been better planned, but apparently the pursuers were concerned with the safety of the captives. The site has since been known as "Breakfast Hill".

<sup>85</sup> Mather, Decennium Luctuosum, 271-2.

<sup>86</sup> Penhallow, The History of the Wars, 15.

<sup>87</sup> Penhallow, The History of the Wars, 36.

<sup>88</sup> See Penhallow, The History of the Wars, 102; Baxter, ed. Doc. Hist. Me., Vol. V, 57, Belknap, The History of New Hampshire, 294; Sylvester, Indian Wars of New England, 342.



Often at odds under normal circumstances, this cooperation lasted at least as long as the adrenaline flowed.

As an instinctive impulse, the reaction to the intrusion of war on the frontier was brief and relatively simple, however, the reaction to war on the provincial level was far more complex and deliberate. The formal involvement in war by the governments of Massachusetts and New Hampshire signified the beginning of economic hardship, personal and collective sacrifice, death and destruction. Although some support came from England, the initiation of war forced the provincial governments to activate their military system to defend the frontier communities as well as carry the war to the enemy. The administrative backbone of that system on the local level were the militia companies and committees. The officers and committee members enabled the provincial governments to gather and distribute supplies, prepare the inhabitants for their immediate defense, and raise soldiers for provincial service. But it was the provincial soldiers, separated from the inhabitants and the militia by virtue of their active service, who actually waged the war for the colonies.

## CHAPTER TWO

### GARRISONS

In the 1760's Thomas Hutchinson, reviewing the recent history of the Indian wars in New England, concluded that "the settlement of a new country could never be effected, if the inhabitants should confine themselves to cities or walled towns. A frontier there must be, and nothing less than making every house a fort, and furnishing every traveller with a strong guard, could have been an effectual security against an enemy, as greedy after their prey as a wolf, and to whom the woods were equally natural and familiar."<sup>1</sup> The governments of New Hampshire and Massachusetts were committed to defend their frontier line because by its definition as a border area, the collapse of the northern frontier would simply have meant that the older,

---

<sup>1</sup> Hutchinson, Thomas, The History of the Colony and Province of Massachusetts Bay (London, 1768; reprint Cambridge, MA, 1936), 75. - As it was impossible to turn every house into a fort and provide every traveller with an armed escort, Douglas Leach has correctly interpreted this statement as meaning "a man who undertook to be a pioneer had to accept as an occupational hazard the possibility of being scalped." - Douglas Edward Leach, The Northern Colonial Frontier, 1607-1763 (New York, 1966), 113. Or to use a more colloquial phrase, "It was a dirty job, but someone had to do it".

more established communities to their south would have become more exposed to the ravages of the enemy. As the Bay government stated in 1715 in granting the establishment of Brunswick and Topsham, Maine, "a Strong Settlement there will greatly tend to dislodge the Indians from their Principal Fishery, keep them from chief carrying Places, and be possibly a Means of removing them further from us, if another War should happen."<sup>2</sup> In addition, the government of Massachusetts was most anxious to maintain communities in the eastern areas of the District of Maine as the title to that land, especially around the Kennebec river and eastward, was disputed, and in any land dispute possession is nine-tenths of the law. Therefore, it was in the best interests of the Bay government, and the older communities in Massachusetts, to give full support to the towns on the frontier.

While all the communities along the frontier line were potential targets during the early French wars, especially vulnerable were those towns contiguous with the major invasion routes - particularly the Kennebec, Saco, Merrimack and Connecticut rivers,<sup>3</sup> as well as those whose geographic

---

<sup>2</sup> James Phinney Baxter, ed., Documentary History of the State of Maine, (Portland, ME, 1916), Collections of the Maine Historical Society, 2nd Series, Vol. XXIII, 239.

<sup>3</sup> North Yarmouth and Falmouth (and later Brunswick and Topsham) were usually attacked by raiding parties from the Kennebec. Scarborough, Saco and Wells were exposed to the Saco river, Dunstable, Haverhill and Amesbury were situated along the Merrimack, and Deerfield, Hatfield and Northampton along the Connecticut. In

location reduced potential support from neighboring towns. Among the latter were all the towns along the Maine coast and the province of New Hampshire. With the sea at their backs and removed from the population centers around Boston and along the North Shore, they had to rely on their own resources and direct aid by sea from the provincial governments. Lancaster, located on the western flank of the eastern war zone, also suffered from similar handicaps. Although the inhabitants on the frontier organized themselves for their own protection, enrolled their men on the militia rolls and constructed fortified sanctuaries, ultimately they had to depend on provincial aid and soldiers to bolster their defense.

The communities on the frontier needed the support of their governments for the strife of the French wars struck at their very existence.<sup>4</sup> The incidents of destruction, loss of life, captivity and separation, experienced by communities on the frontier, "the Hazards and Sorrows," as Cotton Mather wrote, "which you suffer by lying so near unto

---

addition to these water routes, an overland trail ran from the Winnepesaukee-Ossipee area south to the New Hampshire communities of Rochester, Dover and Oyster River. Present day Route 16 approximates this route.

<sup>4</sup> John Keegan and Richard Holmes recently observed that "the experience of war is neither the prerogative nor the exclusive fate of fighting soldiers ... children, women, the old, the non-combatant, the pacifist are all shaken from their familiar routines, sometimes by terror, by hardship, by sadness and loss, sometimes by excitement and exhilaration." See John Keegan and Richard Holmes, Soldiers: A History of Men in Battle (New York, 1985), 259.

a Barbarous Enemy": are too familiar to mention in detail.<sup>5</sup> But beyond the immediate consequences of desolation and death, warfare on the New England frontier meant the almost total disruption of the economic basis of the area.<sup>6</sup> All business activities -- agriculture, mastng, fishing, milling -- were at risk in time of war. As Charles Frost informed the government of Massachusetts in 1747, the people on the Maine frontier "cannot pretend without the utmost hazard, to plant or sow, or carry on any other business, especially on the most out and exposed parts. And unless immediate succor or assistance I cannot perceive how Gorham Town, Marblehead, and Sacarappy can subsist."<sup>7</sup> The inability to produce food and maintain an economy, and the constant threat to life and property convinced many people on the frontier that they needed to leave their homes for more secure settlements. Whether this abandonment was by individuals or whole communities, the end result was the loss of territory and the gradual erosion of the frontier line.

---

<sup>5</sup> Cotton Mather, Frontiers Well-Defended (Boston, 1707), 3. The psychological impact of these horrors is explored in Chapter Twelve.

<sup>6</sup> Jeremy Belknap, The History of New Hampshire (Reprint of 1831 edition, New York, 1970) Vol 1, 287. - Belknap wrote that "the danger to which these distressed people were constantly exposed, did not permit them to cultivate their lands to any advantage."

<sup>7</sup> Herbert Milton Sylvester, Indian Wars of New England (Boston, 1910), Vol. III, 390.

The effects of abandonment on individuals involved personal tragedy - the loss of valuables and property, and sometimes the splintering of families. According to Jeremy Belknap, the New Hampshire families forced to abandon their homes along the Connecticut river during King George's War "deposited in the earth, such furniture and utensils as could be saved by that means; they carried off on horseback such as were portable; and the remainder, with their buildings, was left as a prey to the enemy, who came and destroyed or carried away what they pleased."<sup>8</sup> In 1690 Abraham Collins of Casco Bay, "drawn off from thence in to these parts by the Distress of Warre with a Child a bout 18 monthes" put the child in the care of a wet nurse in Boston, but, dissatisfied with the arrangement, later removed it to another nurse in Milton. The town of Milton ordered the child be returned to his father, who refused to have anything to do with it, and in fact "left said Child in the street." The child eventually ended up in the care of Collins' employer who petitioned the General Court to cover his expenses because the child, and indeed the Collins family, had become a victim of the war.<sup>9</sup>

Although safer from Indian attack, the refugees often found their circumstances no better than on the frontier.

---

<sup>8</sup> Belknap, The History of New Hampshire, 291-2.

<sup>9</sup> James Phinney Baxter, ed., Documentary History of the State of Maine, (Portland, ME, 1897), Collections of the Maine Historical Society, 2nd Series, Vol. V, 130-1.

Driven from their home in Maine "by the Enemy", John Ryly's family resided in Charlestown "where they had nothing to maintaine them but the dayly labour" of the husband and father. Unfortunately, John Ryly was pressed and sent back to Maine as soldier, leaving the family "in extream want, having nothing wherewith to feed and cloath them." Jane Ryly petitioned the General Court for assistance for her and her children, requesting either the return of her husband or some sort of grant so her and "her two young Children may not perish for lack of bread."<sup>10</sup> Similar stories and petitions are spread throughout the records of Massachusetts and New Hampshire. Many of these refugees never returned to their frontier holdings, preferring the security of the settled areas, and they or their heirs sold their lands to others. The proprietors of the Pejepscot Company, who resettled the lands around Brunswick and Topsham, Maine, purchased many tracts of land from war refugees or their descendants.<sup>11</sup>

Beyond the personal tragedies involved, the abandonment of frontier communities constituted a serious blow to the war effort of the New England colonies. To halt the erosion of the Maine frontier at the beginning of King William's

---

<sup>10</sup> Baxter, Doc. Hist. Me., Vol. V, 126-7.

<sup>11</sup> Baxter, ed. Doc. Hist. Me., Vol. XXIII - This volumes contains extensive examples of these transactions; Gordon E. Kershaw, The Kennebeck Proprietors, 1749-1775 (Somersworth, NH, 1975), 18-19. These holdings predated the law which allowed land to be confiscated by the government if abandoned without official permission.

War, and the loss of control over disputed territory, the Bay government issued orders to the inhabitants to stay in their communities,<sup>12</sup> but simple directives had little effect as all communities above Wells were soon deserted.<sup>13</sup> Alarmed at the drain of able-bodied men from their town, the people of Wells petitioned the government that "there be an effectual care taken that the Inhabitants of this province may not Quit thiere places with out liberty first obtayned from Leguel Authority."<sup>14</sup> In 1693 the General Court passed laws prohibiting the settlers from deserting their lands without permission of the legislature, and enacted specific punishments for those who did so, principally the forfeiture of their holdings.<sup>15</sup> Eastern men who were caught in the older settlements were forced to return to their frontier communities,<sup>16</sup> and orders for the impressment of supplies specifically mentioned that the committees of militia in

---

<sup>12</sup> Cotton Mather, Decennium Luctuosum (1699, reprinted in Charles H. Lincoln, ed., Narratives of the Indian Wars, 1675-1699, New York, 1913), 220.

<sup>13</sup> James Phinney Baxter, ed., Documentary History of the State of Maine, (Portland, ME, 1907), Collections of the Maine Historical Society, 2nd Series, Vol. IX, 42.

<sup>14</sup> Baxter, Doc. Hist. Me., Vol V, 274.

<sup>15</sup> William Pencak, War, Politics & Revolution in Provincial Massachusetts (Boston, 1981), 41; Samuel Adams Drake, The Border Wars of New England, Commonly called King William's and Queen Anne's Wars (1897, reprint of 1910 edition, Williamstown, MA, 1973), 95.

<sup>16</sup> Baxter, Doc. Hist. Me., Vol IX, 39.



Maine had the right to seize any cattle, but "Especially from such persons as Desert the Province."<sup>17</sup>

In order to alleviate their economic distress and obtain direct military aid, settlements sought official designation as a frontier town.<sup>18</sup> Such a designation brought financial support in the form of subsidies to pay the minister's wages and an abatement of provincial taxes.<sup>19</sup> It also meant direct military aid from the province including supplies and soldiers.<sup>20</sup> "It is the humble request of our militia," wrote Robert Pike from Salisbury in 1691, "that our Towne may have the providing of a frontere towne as Last year when ten men were sent to us."<sup>21</sup> The number of soldiers posted in towns along the frontier varied according to need and proximity to the enemy. When Suncook applied to the New Hampshire Legislature in 1747 for military aid, they voted that "four good effective men to be posted at Suncook to guard the same until the twentieth of

---

<sup>17</sup> Maine Province and Court Records (Portland, ME, 1947), Vol III, 300.

<sup>18</sup> Baxter, Doc. Hist. Me., Vol V, 70, 260-0, 274-5.

<sup>19</sup> Baxter, Doc. Hist. Me., Vol V, 427-9, 471-2, 482-4, 490-2; Everett S. Stackpole, Old Kittery and her Families (Lewiston, ME, 1903), 174.

<sup>20</sup> Baxter, Doc. Hist. Me., Vol V, 61, 274-5; American Antiquarian Society, Mass. Col. 1629-1869, Box 3, Folder 11: Militia returns, Officers commissions and Misc. Papers 1696-1762.

<sup>21</sup> Baxter, Doc. Hist. Me., Vol V, 261.

October next, said men to be shifted once a month."<sup>22</sup> A proposal by the Massachusetts government in 1698 called for twenty to twenty-five men in each of the communities remaining in the district of Maine, and anywhere from two to eight men assigned to the frontier towns within Massachusetts (with the exception of Deerfield which would have sixteen).<sup>23</sup> On at least one occasion, financial aid and military assistance were combined by hiring some of the inhabitants to be posted as soldiers in that town. During King George's War the Bay government allowed up to eighteen men from New Marblehead (Windham), Maine to draw full pay as soldiers. They stood watches with the "western men" stationed in the town but were not required to join in scouting, and they were to be protected by the "western men" when they worked in the fields. The pay they drew was divided among all the families in the community. Despite grumbling from the provincial soldiers and their officers, the government of Massachusetts through this unusual financial arrangement prevented the desertion of this frontier town.<sup>24</sup>

---

<sup>22</sup> Nathaniel Bouton, ed., Documents and Records Relating to the Province of New Hampshire from 1738-1749 (Nashua, NH, 1871), New Hampshire State and Provincial Records, Vol. V, p. 509.

<sup>23</sup> Baxter, Doc. Hist. Me., Vol V 513.

<sup>24</sup> Charles E. Clark, The Eastern Frontier: The Settlement of Northern New England, 1610-1763 (New York, 1970), 192-3.

Another community requested military assistance, and then changed its mind when the soldiers arrived. The Isles of Shoals, situated off the coast of Maine and New Hampshire, was a raw, independent, and God-less community of fishermen who had little respect or use for the organized governments on the mainland, except when the Indian Wars struck too close to home.<sup>25</sup> When the nearby town of York was destroyed in January, 1692, the citizens of the Isles of Shoals realized just how vulnerable they were, and in their panic they requested military aid from Massachusetts the following day. "We beseech and intreat your honours that we may not be left to the favour of our enemies ... please send us a man of strict and good conduct ... that may joyne with the heads of this place to bare Rule and keep ordour amongst us." They also requested forty soldiers "whose charge both for meat drinke and wages we will att our own cost freely disburse and discharge."<sup>26</sup> Three weeks later the request was repeated and the officer and forty soldiers sent, however, when they arrived they encountered a distinct hostility and refusal to provide the promised quarters and food. Many of the fishermen were employees of wealthy businessmen on the mainland, and these businessmen specifically ordered that support be withheld. The chagrined authors of the original petition wrote to the Governor and Council com-

---

<sup>25</sup> For more on the Isle of Shoals checkered past, see Clark, The Eastern Frontier.

<sup>26</sup> Baxter, ed., Doc. Hist. Me., Vol V, 312-3.

plaining about "those who like Bullocks unaccustomed to the yoke are exceedingly loath to be ruled they being many of them persons, who came here for an employ, only because they would be ungoverned and free from all manner of publick charge."<sup>27</sup> The government finally informed their commander that if the support was not forthcoming that he should "draw off and leave them to stand upon their own defense",<sup>28</sup> and they informed the inhabitants of the Isles of Shoals that "it may occasion no small Sorrowful Reflections, when your Selves and Estates become a prey to the Enemy, that you rejected the Assistance readily offered you upon your desire."<sup>29</sup>

It is unknown if the Isles of Shoals finally provided the promised support, however, soldiers sent to the more exposed areas of the frontier line generally had fewer problems finding accommodations. Usually constituting part of a larger offensive/defensive force, the provincial soldiers destined to bolster exposed towns were marched to the frontier and distributed among those communities.<sup>30</sup> The soldiers were assigned to garrison houses within each town,

---

<sup>27</sup> Baxter, ed., Doc. Hist. Me., Vol V, 363.

<sup>28</sup> Baxter, ed., Doc. Hist. Me., Vol V, 370.

<sup>29</sup> Baxter, ed., Doc. Hist. Me., Vol V, 372.

<sup>30</sup> Journals of the Rev. Thomas Smith and the Rev. Samuel Deane (Portland, ME, 1849), 113. - The Reverend Thomas Smith of Falmouth wrote in his diary in 1744 that "the soldiers came down here. The Province have raised five hundred, three hundred of them for the eastern country ... eighty-five of them are posted in this town, and two of them in my garrison."

although complete coverage was rarely possible. For example, of the sixteen garrisons in Berwick in 1711, only nine had soldiers assigned.<sup>31</sup> Provincial officers were instructed to post their soldiers in garrisons on the outskirts, or "most exposed parts", of the town where they were more likely to do the service they were supposed to do.<sup>32</sup>

The garrison houses to which these provincial soldiers were posted were the first line of defense on the northern frontier.<sup>33</sup> These ubiquitous structures, whose numbers varied from town to town, were usually owned by local officials, officers of the militia and ministers being the most common, or were simply strategically located.<sup>34</sup> They became not only the center of military activity, but often served as public houses and taverns as well.<sup>35</sup> Some of

---

<sup>31</sup> Stackpole, Old Kittery, 177; see also Charles Edward Banks, History of York, Maine (Boston, 1931-35), Vol. II, 225.

<sup>32</sup> AAS, Mass. Col. 1629-1869, Box 3, Folder 11: Militia returns, Officers commissions and Misc. Papers 1696-1762; Baxter, Doc. Hist. Me., Vol IX, 247.

<sup>33</sup> Mather, Decennium Luctuosum, 243-4; Chandler E. Potter, The Military History of New Hampshire from its Founding until the Present Time (Report of the Adjutant-General of the State of New Hampshire for the Year ending June 1, 1866, Concord, NH, 1866), 20; Baxter, Doc. Hist. Me., Vol V, 260, 314, 320.

<sup>34</sup> Stackpole, Old Kittery, 177, 179-80; Banks, History of York, Maine, Vol. II, 222-7; Journal of Rev. Smith, 113.

<sup>35</sup> "Canterbury was an extreme frontier town, and the garrison of Capt. Jeremiah Clough, at that place, was made a rendezvous for the Provincial troops, and a depot for provisions." See Potter, The Military History

these structures were simply a single house built of squared logs laid horizontally on top of each other.<sup>36</sup> The Clark garrison in Cape Neddick, Maine, was forty feet long and twenty-two feet wide with a kitchen extension. The walls were made of squared timbers twenty inches wide and five inches thick, dovetailed at the corners and built without a frame. The lower floor had three rooms plus the kitchen and the second floor, which projected out over the first, had four rooms.<sup>37</sup> The windows and doors were strengthened as well. The Gilman garrison in Exeter had a heavy covering door which was raised or lowered in front of the regular door by use of a pulley system.<sup>38</sup>

As the French wars progressed it became common to turn these fortified houses into small forts by erecting a palisade or outer wall of upright logs set into the ground.<sup>39</sup> There was a fortified gate and flankers, or log towers, built at opposite corners of the palisade which

---

of New Hampshire, 55; Lt. Joseph Storer, owner of a prominent garrison in Wells had a license for keeping a public house. See Maine Court Records, 288; The Gilman family who owned a garrison in Exeter, New Hampshire were all political leaders in the community, officers in the local militia, and operated a public house out of their garrison. See Robbins Paxson Gilman, The Old Logg House by the Bridge (Portsmouth, NH, 1985).

<sup>36</sup> Hutchinson, History of Massachusetts, 50.

<sup>37</sup> Edward Emerson Bourne, "Garrison Houses, York County," in Collections of the Maine Historical Society, 1876, Vol VII, 112-3.

<sup>38</sup> Gilman, The Old Logg House, 39-42.

<sup>39</sup> William Hutchison Rowe, Ancient North Yarmouth and Yarmouth, Maine, 1636-1936 (Yarmouth, ME, 1937), 46; Leach, Northern Frontier, 81.

could serve as watch towers and cover the outer walls in case of attack. These larger garrisons had smaller houses built either within the palisade or around the outside to accommodate the other families seeking shelter.<sup>40</sup> The Larrabee garrison in Kennebunk, built in 1720, had a fourteen foot high palisade, with corner sentry boxes and a large projection over the main gate, surrounding five single story buildings, two to accommodate local families, two for provincial soldiers posted there and the Larrabee dwelling itself, the largest and strongest, in the center.<sup>41</sup>

Families within the community were assigned to the nearest garrison, and the numbers involved combined with the length of stay, could create intolerable living conditions. "We Consider your uneasy condition," observed Cotton Mather in his sermon Frontiers Well-Defended, "when you are thrust and Heaped up together in Garrisons, where the Common Comforts of your Lives must needs have an Extreme Abridgement brought upon them."<sup>42</sup> The word "heaped" is very appropriate. After the Indian attack on York in 1692, the survivors took shelter in three garrisons, and Captain John Floyd of Kittery, arriving to succor his neighbors, reported that "there is a hundred souls in Captain Alcock's house that have their whole dependence upon him for bread."<sup>43</sup>

---

<sup>40</sup> Hutchinson, History of Massachusetts, 50.

<sup>41</sup> Bourne, "Garrison Houses," Me Hist Soc Coll, 116.

<sup>42</sup> Mather, Frontiers, 4.

<sup>43</sup> Baxter, Doc. Hist. Me., Vol V, 314.

Garrisons, depending on their size and situation, regularly housed one to fourteen families and averaged twenty-five to thirty "souls". A list of twenty-one garrisons in York in 1711 reveals that six had thirty or more individuals assigned, and the Preble garrison, listed as the "Store House", had sixty-four.<sup>44</sup> At the same time over in the Berwick area of Kittery, of fifteen garrisons occupied, the Neal garrison had ten families and seventy souls, Plaisted's had fourteen families and seventy-four people, and the Spencer garrison sheltered one hundred.<sup>45</sup>

Such close quarters created uncomfortable situations, and unusual social behavior, especially when evidence of enemy activity precluded extensive absences from the protective walls. Charles Clark, in The Eastern Frontier, related the story of Alice Metherel, who found the Curtis garrison in Wells "a happy frolicking place". Alice, whose husband had disappeared to parts unknown and who had borne the child of one of the few black slaves in the district five years previously, shared a room with a soldier from Kittery named John Thompson, even though "most of the people that did belong to the garrison did lie in there little houses nere the garison." The arrangement bothered some of the other soldiers and two or three older women, not because they

---

<sup>44</sup> Banks, History of York, Maine, Vol. II, 225.

<sup>45</sup> Stackpole, Old Kittery, 177.



shared a room, but because Alice got pregnant and named Thompson as the father.<sup>46</sup>

Added to this cramped, uncomfortable "heap" of humanity were the provincial soldiers assigned to bolster the defenses of the frontier towns. Normally, twenty to thirty soldiers were assigned to the exposed towns with one to four being posted in individual garrisons.<sup>47</sup> Whether they were specifically raised for garrison duty, or were assigned when their scout or expedition outlived its usefulness,<sup>48</sup> the soldiers operated under the dual command of the provincial officers and the militia officer who commanded the garrison, although the provincial officers took precedence. The men were ordered to obey the commands of the masters of the garrisons where they were posted and not absent themselves without official leave, and their principal duties were to guard the inhabitants as they performed their daily labors and add their weight to the defense of the garrison if attacked.<sup>49</sup> The overlapping command situation could create difficulty if protocol and diplomacy were not observed. In

---

<sup>46</sup> Clark, Eastern Frontier, 70.

<sup>47</sup> Potter, The Military History of New Hampshire, 107-8; Banks, History of York, Maine, Vol. II, 222-7; Stackpole, Old Kittery, 177.

<sup>48</sup> Sergeant Trott's Journal - Trott divided his men among local garrison when he felt they were too few in number to venture into the woods. See Rowe, Ancient North Yarmouth, 98.

<sup>49</sup> William Blake Trask, Letters of Colonel Thomas Westbrook and others Relative to Indian Affairs in Maine, 1722-1726, (Boston, 1901), 17.

1690 Simon Willard was forced to leave his command in Falmouth to discuss the war effort with the government in Boston. He placed various provincial sergeants in command of the soldiers in local garrisons, including Sergeant Richard Hicks at Ingersols, with the overall command of troops outside of the fort, and Sergeant Joseph Huit at Lawrence's garrison. Willard admonished Huit to be "always advising with sergeant Hicks as occasion may be, not changing of Souldiers without the consenting of both officers concerned," meaning the militia officers Ingersol and Lawrence.<sup>50</sup>

The issues of military protocol and the effects of close quarters, as well as other irritants such as differences in religion, could lead to animosity between the inhabitants and the provincial soldiers. Cotton Mather addressed the potential for hostility between inhabitants and soldiers when he wrote that "Possibly, The Souldiers from other parts Quartered sometimes among you, may occasion some Disorder; For, a Resort of many People to any places, is usually attended with some Disorderly and Exorbinant Behaviors. We assure our selves, that the Souldiers which are sent to your Assistance, will find all possible Civility, in your way of treating them ... But, if any Souldiers that come among you, should be Wild, and Vain, and Lewd, God forbid, that your Children should learn their

---

<sup>50</sup> Baxter, Doc. Hist. Me., Vol V, 95.

wayes, or that your Manners ever should be Corrupted by their Evil Communications."<sup>51</sup>

Mather emphasized the need to work together, and to understand that God may have sent the wild soldiers to be taught the Christian way by example, although he pointed out that pious soldiers should not have cause to complain about frontier families. Often the solution to this kind of irritation was not the Christian ethic, but a request for transfer by either party. For example, in May, 1725, David Parsons wrote the Governor of Massachusetts from Leicester concerning a problem in his garrison. "I met with some difficulty with one of [the soldiers] who is not pleased with my family orders, and his capt being at some distance, takes more liberty then is very pleasing to me (I do not enter a complaint) but if it might be agreeable to your honor a well qualified man 50 miles distant is willing to take his place, and this affair to be quiet."<sup>52</sup> Similarly, Provincial officer Elisha Andrews wrote from Wells in the Fall of 1690 to the Bay government that "I Crave of your Honours that if Souldiers Must be kept here, that we might be Relived and others Sent in our Room: for their is such Anamossity betwixt the souldiers and the inhabitants; that

---

<sup>51</sup> Mather, Frontiers, 20-21.

<sup>52</sup> Letter to Gov from David Parsons, Leicester, May 31, 1725 in AAS, Mass. Col. 1629-1869, Box 3, Folder 11: Militia returns, Officers commissions and Misc. Papers 1696-1762.

their is Little hopes of us Doing any thing that tends to gods honor or the good of the Country."<sup>53</sup>

Another reason for this animosity often grew out of the fact that while the soldiers represented a degree of safety for the frontier communities, they also were a very real strain on their limited supplies of provisions and clothing. Elisha Andrews acknowledged the arrival of "a hundred bushells of indian Corn and rye: 30 Wastcoats: 30 pair of Drawers and a hogshead of salt", but felt this a "Small Supply Considering the poverty of the inhabitants; and the nesessity the Souldiers are in Respect of Cloathing Shirts shoes and stockings that I have a great deal of trouble to keep them here the Inhabitants not Caring for our Company; they not Desiring above twenty; if any."<sup>54</sup> The destruction of crops and livestock by Indian raiding parties, and the obvious physical dangers involved in the further cultivation of their fields diminished the amount of food available on the frontier, and the restriction of all business activity, agricultural or otherwise, hampered trade for essential goods, especially clothing. The presence of provincial soldiers only aggravated this situation.<sup>55</sup>

The inhabitants provided for the soldiers, and themselves, as best they could, working their own fields under the protection of provincial guards, or land in the immedi-

---

<sup>53</sup> Baxter, ed., Doc. Hist. Me., Vol V, 156.

<sup>54</sup> Baxter, ed., Doc. Hist. Me., Vol V, 156.

<sup>55</sup> Baxter, ed., Doc. Hist. Me., Vol IX, 59.

ate area of the garrisons allotted to the families living there. The government informed the owners of these garrisons that they were compensated for this by the increased defense offered by the presence of these other families.<sup>56</sup> All contributions by the inhabitants to the maintenance of the provincial soldiers was to be indemnified by the provincial governments,<sup>57</sup> although this compensation could be delayed which only increased the level of animosity. In 1689, Joseph Prout reported from Falmouth that the inhabitants were "not willing to bring in any [food] without ready payment",<sup>58</sup> and Abram Preble of York sent in a petition proving that he "by himself and others his Neighbors Expended Considerably on the Countrys Service by Billitting of Soulders in the Years 1690: 91 and 94." Preble proceeded to list every meal provided, every horse fed, every night spent by a soldier, every sick soldier tended (including the "winding Sheate" for the one who died), by himself and his neighbors over the course of those three years.<sup>59</sup> Although few are as detailed as Preble's, numerous petitions exist asking compensation for provisions supplied to provincial soldiers.

When provisions were not forthcoming voluntarily, military officials often had to impress what they needed,

---

<sup>56</sup> Baxter, ed., Doc. Hist. Me., Vol IX, 216-7.

<sup>57</sup> Baxter, ed., Doc. Hist. Me., Vol IX, 74.

<sup>58</sup> Baxter, ed., Doc. Hist. Me., Vol V, 8.

<sup>59</sup> Baxter, ed., Doc. Hist. Me., Vol V, 500-4.

although in most instances the inhabitants were compensated for these goods as well.<sup>60</sup> As part of their administrative duties, and to make such seizures perhaps more acceptable, local committees of militia were usually "Impowered to Impress and take any fatt Cattell (for the suply of Country Soldiers) from any person whatsoever,"<sup>61</sup> although provincial officers could press food and cattle if necessary. However, whether voluntarily given or impressed, there often came a time when the supply of food simply gave out, especially after raids or during periods of high enemy activity. "They have allready Killed So many Cattle for the Souldiers," wrote William Vaughn from Portsmouth in 1691, "that they have hardly left where with to Sustain their [own] family's this winter and that many famlyes have hardly bread to eat."<sup>62</sup> At these times it was necessary for the frontier communities to call on their provincial government for supplies.<sup>63</sup>

---

<sup>60</sup> Baxter, ed., Doc. Hist. Me., Vol V, 124. No restitution was made for impressed cattle belonging to inhabitants who had fled the frontier. In 1724, Lieutenant John Lane allowed his men to kill livestock belonging to local people without arranging compensation. Examined before his superiors, Lane promised to make restitution and refrain from similar action in the future - James Phinney Baxter, ed. Documentary History of the State of Maine (Portland, ME, 1907), Collections of the Maine Historical Society, 2nd Series, Vol. X, 191.

<sup>61</sup> Maine Court Records, 300.

<sup>62</sup> Baxter, ed., Doc. Hist. Me., Vol V, 303.

<sup>63</sup> Baxter, ed., Doc. Hist. Me., Vol V, 10-11, 300.

The governments of New England collected supplies for the "reliefe of the garrisoned souldiers Imploied against the comon enemy in the eastern partes and the poore famelyes yet remaining there or forced away from their habitations in distresse and want" through "free and voluntary contribution", or impressment, in the older settlements.<sup>64</sup> Sent to the eastern frontier by sea and to the west overland, the goods were placed in the care of "some Suitable person to be appointed by the said Committee [of Militia] in each towne" who was responsible for the equitable distribution of the supplies.<sup>65</sup> This "faithful person" had to keep a "distinct and particular account" of provincial supplies, and usually took charge of the impressment of local provisions.<sup>66</sup> Involving complicated paperwork, control over compensation, equitable distribution and impressment of supplies, and constant letter writing to provincial governments, the position of distribution officer in frontier communities often became one continuous aggravation, with very little reward or acknowledgement.

Beyond the obvious need for food, the most serious problem for the inhabitants and the soldiers posted on the frontier involved an adequate supply of clothing. While some food was produced on the frontier, very little clothing was made, especially in the early years of the French wars.

---

<sup>64</sup> Baxter, ed., Doc. Hist. Me., Vol V, 309.

<sup>65</sup> Baxter, ed., Doc. Hist. Me., Vol V, 304.

<sup>66</sup> Baxter, ed., Doc. Hist. Me., Vol V, 13.

Frontier areas had to rely on the older communities where textile production - spinning, weaving and tailoring - was protected from the disruption of war, and where cloth and clothing could be imported from England. Inhabitants on the frontier used their agricultural products to provide a means of exchange to obtain clothing and other necessities. As supply officer for the town of Falmouth in 1689, Joseph Prout impressed a "parcell of beef which was on board a Shallop bound westward, belonging to One Wallace which he was [carrying] to purchase cloathing for his family ... I promised him that he Should be Speedily paid."<sup>67</sup> In fact, clothing supplied by the provincial government became a means of payment for local provisions. Thus the overworked Joseph Prout complained to Governor Bradstreet that the shipment of clothing barely met the needs of the soldiers so that "little of it can be Spared towards the paying for or purchasing of meat."<sup>68</sup>

The provincial soldiers sent to garrison the frontier towns were particularly affected by clothing shortages. Whether volunteers or pressed men, they generally wore one set of clothes - coat, waistcoat, breeches and shoes - with perhaps some spare shirts and socks. Hard or extended service would eventually wear out this initial wardrobe, and if the soldier's family could not provide for replacements, which was often the case, then the provincial government had

---

<sup>67</sup> Baxter, ed., Doc. Hist. Me., Vol V, 8.

<sup>68</sup> Baxter, ed., Doc. Hist. Me., Vol V, 9.



the obligation. In addition, soldiers raised in the summer months forced to extend their tour of duty into the winter needed clothing suitable to the climate. Therefore, militia distribution officers were constantly requesting clothing to supply the provincial soldiers on the frontier. "Some fall Shoes are desired and expected by some of the Soldiers," wrote the diligent Joseph Prout, "as also Some Stockings and Some more Shirt cloath, as also Some more coats, breeches, Neckcloaths &c."<sup>69</sup>

At the beginning of Queen Anne's War, just a few days after the massive attack on the communities in Maine on August 10, 1703, the Bay government ordered the provincial commissary officer, Andrew Belcher, to raise provisions in anticipation of the extensive employment of soldiers on the eastern frontier, the "stores and magazine for the Eastern Parts be lodged at Mr. Peperel's garrison in Kittery."<sup>70</sup> Belcher had to provide "for the use of the forces rayzed for H.M. service, hatchets, powder-hornes, belts and snapsacks of each 500, large shoes and stockens of each pair, and that they be delivered to the souldiers as they shall have occasion to be charged therewith upon request."<sup>71</sup> In order to assemble these stores it was necessary to impress the

---

<sup>69</sup> Baxter, ed., Doc. Hist. Me., Vol V, 11.

<sup>70</sup> "Minutes of Massachusetts Council, August 19, 1703," Calendar of State Papers, Colonial Series, America and West Indies, December 1, 1702-1703 (Reprint of 1913 edition, Vaduz, 1964), Vol. 21, No. 1039.

<sup>71</sup> "Minutes of Massachusetts Council, August 19, 1703," Calendar of State Papers, Vol. 21, No. 1039.

items themselves or the labor necessary to make them. On August 23 the Massachusetts Council "Ordered that a warrant be made out to impress six or eight shoe-makers to be employed by direction of Mr. Joseph Bridgham forthwith to make shoes for the supply of the forces."<sup>72</sup> Despite these efforts, however, deficiencies in supplies and provisions would continue to complicate the war effort.

Critical shortages of food and clothing could impair the ability of the frontier towns to maintain their defenses and even their communities. A lack of food could lead to sickness, as in the case of Gorham, Maine during King George's War when an outbreak of black tongue killed four, and affected so many men, including the eleven soldiers stationed there, that the women had to stand guard.<sup>73</sup> One of the families in Gorham was so destitute that the woman of the house rode alone to Falmouth at night, purchased Indian corn, took it to a mill to be ground, then waited until dark to make her journey home.<sup>74</sup> Provincial officer James Converse wrote the Bay government from Portsmouth in 1690 "to Informe your Honors of the miserable Condetion that we are in for want of bread and cloaths ... our Soldiers are sick some of the small pox and others of A feaver, I have borrowed bread for the Hospetall, and the sick in severall

---

<sup>72</sup> "Minutes of Massachusetts Council, August 23, 1703," Calendar of State Papers, Vol. 21, No. 1044.

<sup>73</sup> Hugh D. McLellan, History of Gorham, Maine (Portland, ME, 1903), 60.

<sup>74</sup> Sylvester, History of the Indian Wars, Vol III, 400.

places, and I am not Able to provide for so many people upon my own account, for severall Gennerous Gentlemen of the place are weary with doing for the publique."<sup>75</sup>

Such shortages of food and clothing could force the provincial soldiers to abandon their posts. After an attack on Portsmouth in 1695 the garrisons throughout New Hampshire were reinforced, but the six men sent to Dover were discharged after a short time as the town was "destitute of all manner of provision for the subsistence of said soldiers, as the law directs in that kind."<sup>76</sup> Soldiers stationed in Wells in 1691 complained in September to the Governor and Council that "wee Humbly Conceive it is not unknown to your Selves that wee have ben in the servis a long time: and as farr as wee Can understand are like to Continue longer: which wee are not Capable to doe, being maney of us alredy almost naked; we are willing to Serve your Honors in what we are Capable of, but not with out Cloathing."<sup>77</sup> In October, Richard Buckley, another government commissary officer, wrote from Portsmouth that "I Cannot understand of any Cloathing to come for the Soldiers without which I conclude it Impossible for the most of them to subsist, therefore I expect e're long to be called home ... the Soldiers as yet as far as I can perceive continue in

---

<sup>75</sup> Baxter, Doc. Hist. Me., Vol V, 157.

<sup>76</sup> Potter, The Military History of New Hampshire, 16.

<sup>77</sup> Baxter, ed., Doc. Hist. Me., Vol V, 295.

reasonable good order but I fear they will no longer than till they shall understand there are no supply's comeing."<sup>78</sup>

On occasion soldiers used a lack of supply, or at least an alleged shortage, as an excuse to desert. In April, 1690, three soldiers, William Williams, Thomas North and Richard Warren, left their assigned posts in Berwick "under the pretence they wanted shirts to chang". When their shortage was learned all three were offered shirts by others in the garrison, but, as the inhabitants later reported, North announced he was heading for Boston and "would not be stopd nor hindered as long as hee had any powder and shott, And that it was little odds to him to kill [one] of us as an Indian." Their sergeant, apprised of their intention, and the offers of shirts, tried to persuade them to stay, but Williams, North and Warren left anyway promising to return that night, a promise no one believed. The report of this affair concluded with a list of witnesses to the soldier's "opprobrious highe and wicked speeches slighting of command, only Warren was sober butt other Two sordid fellows full of Rascality in word and actions."<sup>79</sup>

As indicated by the story of Williams, North and Warren, the animosity between inhabitants and the provincial soldiers went beyond the problems of cramped quarters and minimal supplies; the inhabitants were not always impressed with their defenders. Unfortunately, the caliber of soldier

---

<sup>78</sup> Baxter, ed., Doc. Hist. Me., Vol V, 299.

<sup>79</sup> Baxter, ed., Doc. Hist. Me., Vol V, 73.

posted in garrisons along the frontier was not high because provincial officers retained their best men, the most physically fit and the most enthusiastic volunteers, for scouting and raids, and posted those incapable of marching and the pressed men in garrisons. When provincial forces were reduced after a campaign, it was the pressed or hired men who were left behind in garrison, men whose enthusiasm for the service of their country was less than could be desired, at least as far as the inhabitants of the frontier were concerned.<sup>80</sup>

The practice of posting the less desirable soldiers in garrisons would continue throughout the early French war period. In July, 1691 Daniel King and John March reported from Portsmouth that of one hundred and eight soldiers available for their raid into Maine, "Not above sixty ... are fitt for any Service but to Keep Garrison."<sup>81</sup> William Vaughn found King's and March's men to be in a "shattred Condition" on their return from the east in August. He found them "uncapable of any further Service att present, then strengthening the frontiers", and so posted them in garrisons along the Maine coast and New Hampshire.<sup>82</sup> In 1724, Colonel Thomas Westbrook reported a request by the residents of Kittery to have five or six men posted at a new garrison they were constructing. "It being so great a

---

<sup>80</sup> Baxter, ed., Doc. Hist. Me., Vol IX, 13, 73.

<sup>81</sup> Baxter, ed., Doc. Hist. Me., Vol V, 264.

<sup>82</sup> Baxter, ed., Doc. Hist. Me., Vol V, 289.

Service to so many people," wrote Westbrook, "I have presumed to lodge five or six Ineffective men that were not fitt to march, till your Honors pleasure be known in that affair."<sup>83</sup> The New Hampshire Assembly received a petition in 1748 from Ebenezer Eastman "in behalf of Joseph Pudney a soldier formerly wounded in the service praying that the said Pudney might be posted at some garrison in Pennecook." The Assembly granted his request.<sup>84</sup> In addition to physically handicapped and pressed men, it was common to post servants and young men in garrisons, or "such as may most conveniently be spared from home."<sup>85</sup>

The poor behavior of these soldiers was often noted by the inhabitants and even their own officers. Joseph Prout reported that "those soldiers left here are most of them men of Ill behavior and take little notice of their Commander, ... many of them do often Swear that they will march away home."<sup>86</sup> Sylvanus Davis, commander of Fort Loyal in Falmouth in 1689, described his attempts to hold the soldiers who, along with the inhabitants, had just abandoned North Yarmouth. Davis showed them the orders from Boston requiring them to stay, but this made them all the more

---

<sup>83</sup> Trask, Letters of Colonel Thomas Westbrook, 54.

<sup>84</sup> Nathaniel Bouton, ed., Documents and Records Relating to the Province of New Hampshire from 1738-1749 (Nashua, NH, 1871), New Hampshire State and Provincial Papers, Vol. V, 910, 538.

<sup>85</sup> Baxter, ed., Doc. Hist. Me., Vol V, 73.

<sup>86</sup> Baxter, ed., Doc. Hist. Me., Vol V, 10.

obstinate, "laffing and Shouting" they told Davis they would stay over their dead bodies "for thay had dun thaire Duty that they was hired for."<sup>87</sup> Even when under actual attack, the quality, not to mention the backbone, of some soldiers posted in garrisons was found lacking. The nineteenth century historian Samuel Adams Drake related the story of an attack on the Bradley garrison in Haverhill on February 8, 1703. While the men were at work elsewhere, Bradley's wife was boiling soap and a soldier, Jonathan Johnson, was "loitering around the house". The Indians burst in capturing Hannah Bradley, after she gamely threw a ladlefull of boiling soap in the face of the first Indian, and they easily killed the loitering soldier named Johnson.<sup>88</sup> Four years later, in the same town, Indians attacked the garrison of the town's minister, Benjamin Rolfe. They fired through the door shattering the wood and wounding the minister, then bursting through, they killed the minister and his wife and child. "Paralyzed with fear, the cowardly soldiers were slain while begging for mercy."<sup>89</sup>

Although not all garrison soldiers were unhealthy, disabled, pressed, expendable, and cowardly, enough of them were to irritate the inhabitants whom they were trying to protect. After his experiences with deserting soldiers, Sylvanus Davis was convinced that the practice of hiring

---

<sup>87</sup> Baxter, ed., Doc. Hist. Me., Vol IX, 42.

<sup>88</sup> Drake, The Border Wars of New England, 168-9.

<sup>89</sup> Drake, The Border Wars of New England, 244.

soldiers would be the ruin of the country.<sup>90</sup> Elisha Hutchison agreed with Davis' sentiments and suggested in 1692 that the defense of the Maine frontier would be enhanced by "Maintaining a garrison at Pegipscott or about Kenibeck, with a sufficient force of Stout able men (and not such Children as usually are sent for Souldiers)".<sup>91</sup>

In two respects, one negative and one positive, the garrisons proved to be more a psychological defense than an actual military strong point. The proximity of the garrison houses and the presence of the provincial soldiers, no matter what their quality, led to over-confidence. The strength of the building itself seemed to be a sufficient safeguard so that in many cases sentries and watches were not posted. In Northampton a garrison which had no guard was attacked and the Indians simply thrust their muskets through the loopholes and shot the inhabitants as they emerged from their rooms.<sup>92</sup> In Dunstable twenty troopers returning from a patrol turned their horses out to graze and entered a garrison where they had a "carousal". No guard was posted and so the Indians shot the owner as he left the palisade, rushed through the gate and into the house before the troopers could reach their weapons. Grabbing chairs and

---

<sup>90</sup> Baxter, ed., Doc. Hist. Me., Vol IX, 42.

<sup>91</sup> Baxter, ed., Doc. Hist. Me., Vol V, 336.

<sup>92</sup> Penhallow, Samuel, The History of the Wars of New England with the Eastern Indians (Boston, 1726; Facsimile Reprint, Annotated by Edward Wheelock, Williamstown, MA, 1973), 13.



clubs they finally forced the Indians out of the house but not without losing half their number."<sup>3</sup> In both cases the security of the strong house created an impression of safety.

Such carelessness would continue throughout the French wars whenever people tired of their cramped garrison existence. "Nothing could be more irksome than to be shut up within the four walls of a garrison," observed Samuel Adams Drake, "hence, in spite of warnings, orders or entreaties, fatal risks were taken, and many valuable lives thrown away."<sup>4</sup> Lt-Governor John Usher reported to the Board of Trade in February, 1704 that he had "visited the out-garrisons, [and found] all families at their respective houses, not in garrison, and secure as if no war."<sup>5</sup> In 1723 the people of Dover, New Hampshire, tired of garrison living, began to return to the safety of the strong walls only at night until eventually even this precaution was abandoned with fatal consequences for Aaron Rawlins and his twelve year old daughter.<sup>6</sup> Despite laws requiring all persons to abide in their assigned garrisons or be fined,<sup>7</sup>

---

<sup>3</sup> Drake, The Border Wars of New England, 218.

<sup>4</sup> Drake, The Border Wars of New England, 224.

<sup>5</sup> "Lt-Governor John Usher to Council of Trade and Plantations, February 19, 1704," Calendar of State Papers, Colonial Series, America and West Indies, 1704-1705 (Reprint of 1916 edition, Vaduz, 1964), Vol. 22, No. 120.

<sup>6</sup> Belknap, History of New Hampshire, 203n.

<sup>7</sup> Banks, History of York, Maine, Vol. II, 317.

the inhabitants needed to get on with living, planting, milling, masting - all the work which was to be protected by the provincial soldiers posted in the town. But when this work became extensive, tired men neglected simple precautions, they became reckless and careless, such as the hunter in New Hopkinton, New Hampshire who departed from his garrison before dawn while the other occupants were asleep - and left the door open."<sup>88</sup>

The negligence and laxity on the part of the inhabitants of frontier communities emanating from this false sense of security represented by the garrisons created nothing but anxiety and aggravation for the provincial officers assigned to protect them. Captain Elisha Andrews wrote to the Bay government in 1690 that the inhabitants of Wells were at present in garrison, but "several are desirous of going home to their own houses, and the most part of them is for keeping little or no watch, for there is no command amongst them, which makes them incapable of defense, that if the enemy comes upon us I am afraid their carelessness will be both their destruction and ours also."<sup>89</sup> Echoing Andrews concerns thirty-four years later, Colonel Thomas Westbrook recommended that scattered garrisons be called in or they will be surprised by the enemy as "the people generally

---

<sup>88</sup> Belknap, History of New Hampshire, 289.

<sup>89</sup> Edward E. Bourne, The History of Wells and Kennebunk, (Portland, ME, 1875), 202.

preach up peace to themselves if the Indians do not knock some in the head in six or seven days."<sup>100</sup>

However, in addition to the negative aspect of false security, the garrisons could provide positive benefits from a purely psychological stand point by deterring some Indian attacks and saving the lives of people who had no actual defensive capabilities. In 1706 some women caught alone in a garrison during an attack fired the alarm gun, loosened their hair, put on hats and fired muskets out of the loopholes. Their bluff was successful and the raiding party quickly withdrew.<sup>101</sup> Thomas Bickford saved his Oyster River garrison single-handedly by firing muskets from several loopholes, changing hats and shouting orders to imaginary defenders.<sup>102</sup> Similarly, a woman in Dover during an attack in 1712 saved herself by shouting orders and alarms throughout the garrison, even though she was alone, convincing the Indians that the garrison was well-guarded.<sup>103</sup> In 1705 two men from Amesbury, caught in the open without weapons during an Indian raid, took shelter in an abandoned garrison where they found two broken guns without ammunition. Thinking quick, they thrust the muzzles

---

<sup>100</sup> Baxter, ed., Doc. Hist. Me., Vol X, 192. See Chapter One for the friction created between provincial commanders and local militia leaders over inadequate defense precautions.

<sup>101</sup> Potter, The Military History of New Hampshire, 22-23.

<sup>102</sup> Drake, The Border Wars of New England, 99-100.

<sup>103</sup> Drake, The Border Wars of New England, 287.

through the loopholes and kept shouting, "Here they are, but don't fire till they come closer!", and the Indian obligingly kept their distance.<sup>104</sup> In each of these cases, the apparent strength of the buildings and outworks provided a psychological defense where no real military deterrent existed.<sup>105</sup>

Of course, when called to, and prepared, larger garrisons could prove quite adequate for defense against a determined attack.<sup>106</sup> Perhaps the most famous incident occurred at the Storer garrison in Wells, June 9-11, 1692. The Storer garrison had a palisade and flankers with small shacks outside for local families and sat on a small rise just above Wells harbor.<sup>107</sup> The garrison was commanded by Captain James Converse who had fifteen provincial soldiers and an unknown, but apparently small number of inhabitants. In addition there were fifteen men on board two sloops

---

<sup>104</sup> Drake, The Border Wars of New England, 219; Penhallow, History of the Wars, 35. Douglas Leach has doubted the veracity of this and other stories (see Arms for Empire: A Military History of the British Colonies in North America, 1607-1763 (New York, 1973), 130), and no doubt the truth was stretched in some cases, however such accounts of successful bluffs are numerous and so must represent a kernel of truth.

<sup>105</sup> For more on the Indian psychology in war, see chapter ten.

<sup>106</sup> Refer to Mather, Decennium Luctuosum, Drake, The Border Wars of New England, Penhallow, The History of the Wars, and Bourne, The History of Wells, concerning attacks on garrisons in Exeter, July, 1690; York, January 1692; Lancaster, July, 1704; Arrowsick, September, 1722; and Kennebunk, April, 1747.

<sup>107</sup> Bourne, "Garrison Houses," Me Hist Soc Coll, 114.

anchored close to the garrison in the harbor. Bleeding cattle running from the woods warned of the presence of the enemy and on the morning of June 9 a force of five hundred Indians under French command stepped out of the woods, brandishing their weapons, hurling shouts of defiance and musket balls at the garrison. Although they captured one hapless fellow outside the walls, the brisk fire from Converse's men soon drove them back into the woods.

The enemy next concentrated on the sloops, shooting fire arrows in an attempt to set them ablaze. Eventually they attached boards to the front of a cart, a crude sort of mantlet or shield,<sup>108</sup> and pushed it toward the sloops. The cart soon became bogged down in the mud and the men behind slowly picked off as they tried to free it. The Indians spent the night dropping random shots into the garrison, although Converse dispersed some of them by sending six men out to ambush the snipers. Another major assault was threatened the following day and Converse ordered his men to withhold fire until the enemy was close enough. One of the defenders had his nerve fail at this point and suggested the garrison consider a surrender, but Converse simply said he would shoot the next person who raised that issue, and then ordered them to open fire. With Converse running from flanker to flanker directing the fire, and with the women

---

<sup>108</sup> A "mantlet" was a movable shield that protected sappers as they began new sections of trenches during a siege - Keegan and Holmes, Soldiers, 173.

not only loading weapons but firing them as well, the garrison held off the attack.

A final attempt was made against the sloops with a fire raft, however the wind drove it ashore before it reached its objective. Under a flag of truce the French and Indian force attempted to cajole the English into surrendering but Converse would not succumb, so the Indians mutilated and killed their one prisoner out of frustration and left. Forty-eight hours after it began, the siege of Storer's garrison was over.<sup>109</sup>

This siege represents the ultimate example of the military effectiveness of the garrison house. They were a necessary component of frontier defensive strategy, a first line of defense used on the frontier of New France.<sup>110</sup> The northern frontier of New England was a thin line of communities under siege, but its survival depended on more than garrison houses alone, its survival depended on a healthy economy or the ability to plant and harvest, mill grain, fish, and cut lumber and masts. Without the ability to maintain the economic foundation, the French and Indian threat became overwhelming to the inhabitants, and the option of abandoning their communities all the more inviting.

---

<sup>109</sup> Details on the siege come from Mather, Decennium Luctuosum, 232-40 and Drake, The Border Wars of New England, 76-81; see also Hutchinson, History of Massachusetts, and Bourne, History of Wells.

<sup>110</sup> W. J. Eccles, Canada Under Louis XIV, 1663-1701 (London, 1964), 157.

Committed to the preservation of the frontier line, the governments of New Hampshire and Massachusetts had to bolster their frontier with economic aid in the form of grants, tax abatements and contributions of food and clothing. They also stationed soldiers in the towns to protect the inhabitants at their daily labor and augment the defensive capabilities of the local militia, even though the immediate defense of the communities and the garrisons within them was a serious drain on provincial military manpower, a drain which provincial officers tried to compensate for by employing their least competent soldiers for that duty.

In some respects the garrison houses were a dubious blessing. Beyond the diffusion of manpower, the effectiveness of the garrison system, like all the endeavors of mankind, depended so much on the human factor. Garrisons defended by individuals with the fortitude of a James Converse could withstand enemy attacks, and quick-witted individuals in seemingly hopeless situations could use the obvious strength of the garrison to bluff the fragile Indian psyche, but the presence of the garrisons could also lead to a false sense of security and result in carelessness, negligence and ultimately death or captivity. The garrison was an important part of the New England military strategy, a first line of defense, or a last resort for the inhabitants of the frontier towns, but the war effort of New Hampshire and Massachusetts had to consist of more than

**garrison houses if it was to be successful, and that greater effort would devolve almost exclusively on their provincial soldiers.**



## CHAPTER THREE

### PROVINCIAL FORTS

Although garrisons provided a sanctuary and a modicum of protection for the inhabitants and the soldiers stationed there, forts symbolized a permanent military presence on the northern frontier. They not only provided a strong defensive structure, but served as headquarters for the provincial forces in the area, and as barracks for scouting parties. To the Eastern Indians the forts embodied the power and the presence of the English government by providing a site for the negotiation and signing of treaties, and, when built on their major invasion routes, by disrupting their normal operations in time of war. Both the symbolic and very real threat posed by English forts made them special targets for French and Indian raiding parties and expeditions, especially after the expansion of the frontier line and the accelerated fort building program during the 1720's and 30's. Because of the special attention focused by the larger enemy raiding forces on the frontier forts, it could be said they became a magnet drawing the fury of the enemy on themselves and away from the exposed communities.

As the French wars began, only a few forts existed on the northern frontier. When Governor Edmund Andros took his small army into Maine during the fall of 1688, he constructed several small forts to house his soldiers during the winter, however, the majority of these structures were quickly abandoned during the subsequent Glorious Revolution the following Spring.<sup>1</sup> In 1689 the principal forts on the frontier line included one at Pemaquid, Fort Loyal at Falmouth in Casco Bay, a Fort on the Merrimack River at the "upper plantations", and another fort similarly situated on the Connecticut river.<sup>2</sup> Of those four major forts, two, Pemaquid and Fort Loyal, were destroyed by the fall of 1690. During the course of King William's War numerous small forts, like Fort Mary at Saco, Maine in 1693 and a small fort at Newcastle at the mouth of the Piscataqua, were built to protect the surrounding regions.<sup>3</sup> In 1692 Governor

---

<sup>1</sup> Hutchison Papers, Collections of the Massachusetts Historical Society, 85-87, Andros provided a detailed account of the forts and forces he had left in Maine to defend the frontier and the resulting chaos created by the "subversive" government in Boston. The "subversives" replied to this account by offering their own opinions about these forts and the forces posted there. See James Phinney Baxter, ed., Documentary History of the State of Maine (Portland, ME, 1897), Collections of the Maine Historical Society, 2nd Series, Vol. V, 120-23.

<sup>2</sup> Baxter, ed., Doc. Hist. Me., Vol. V, 120-23.

<sup>3</sup> Thornton J. Wingate, "Ancient Pemaquid, An Historical Review" in Collections of the Maine Historical Society, Vol V (Portland, ME 1857), 282; Robert L. Bradley, Maine's First Buildings: The Architecture of Settlement, 1604-1700 (Maine Historic Preservation Commission, 1978), 11; Calendar of State Papers, Colonial Series, America and West Indies, January, 1693

William Phips replaced the destroyed fort at Pemaquid with a substantial, and expensive, stone structure which he named William Henry, but this fort was subsequently captured by a French expedition and destroyed in 1696.

By the beginning of Queen Anne's War, and during the course of that conflict, several forts were added to the defenses of New England. The English military engineer for the colonies, Wolfgang W. Romer, rebuilt the fort at Falmouth Maine,<sup>4</sup> and in New Hampshire, Fort William and Mary, first proposed in 1697 as a replacement for the small fort protecting Portsmouth harbor, was gradually constructed under Romer's supervision. The building and maintenance of this fort would be a constant source of controversy throughout the history of provincial New Hampshire. Although Romer would dispute his contentions later, Lt-Governor John Usher reported the fort completed in 1705 and he asked Whitehall for the cannon to mount in its emplacements.<sup>5</sup> Under the administration of Governor Joseph Dudley,

---

to 14 May, 1696 (Reprint of 1903 edition, Vaduz, 1964), Vol. 14, No. 454.

- <sup>4</sup> Bradley, Maine's First Buildings, 11. No name has emerged from the records for this fort. It was always referred to at the "fort at Casco" to distinguish it from its predecessor Fort Loyal. In Maine Forts, Henry Dunnack referred to this installation as the "New Casco Fort." See Henry Dunnack, Maine Forts (Augusta, ME, 1924), 236.
- <sup>5</sup> Chandler E. Potter, The Military History of New Hampshire from its Founding until the Present Time (Report of the Adjutant-General of the State of New Hampshire for the Year ending June 1, 1866, Concord, NH, 1866), 20-21; "Lt-Governor John Usher to Council of Trade and Plantations, March 21, 1705," Calendar of State Papers, Colonial Series, America and West Indies, 1704-1705

the Bay government completed work on Castle William in Boston harbor, erected fortifications around the trading house at Dunstable,<sup>6</sup> and replaced Fort Mary at Saco, considered to be "ill-placed and ill-built", with a fort at Winter Harbor.<sup>7</sup> Fortifications also existed at Marblehead and Salem.<sup>8</sup>

At the conclusion of Queen Anne's War, the frontier in Maine began to push eastward, and with it the need for protection. The Company of Pejepscot Proprietors, using land at the mouth of the Sagadahoc river which had been purchased from the Indians as well as the heirs of the settlers who had abandoned the region in 1689, established the towns of Brunswick and Topsham in 1715.<sup>9</sup> As part of that settlement the company refurbished and enlarged one of

---

(Reprint of 1916 edition, Vaduz, 1964), Vol. 22, No. 966; "Col. Wolfgang Romer's reply to Council of Trade and Plantations, August, 30, 1708," Calendar of State Papers, Colonial Series, America and West Indies, June, 1708-1709 (Reprint of 1922 edition, Vaduz, 1964), Vol. 24, No. 123. Romer claimed that Governor Dudley stopped work on the fort when Romer's replacement, Captain John Redknapp, arrived in the colonies.

<sup>6</sup> Calendar of State Papers, Colonial Series, America and West Indies, December 1, 1702-1703 (Reprint of 1913 edition, Vaduz, 1964), Vol. 21, No. 302.

<sup>7</sup> "Governor Joseph Dudley to Council of Trade and Plantations, October 2, 1706," Calendar of State Papers, Colonial Series, America and West Indies, 1706-1708 (Reprint of 1916 edition, Vaduz, 1964), Vol. 23, No. 511.

<sup>8</sup> "Governor Joseph Dudley to Council of Trade and Plantations, March 1, 1709," Calendar of State Papers, Vol. 24, No. 391.

<sup>9</sup> Gordon E. Kershaw, The Kennebeck Proprietors, 1749-1775 (Somersworth, NH, 1975), 16-17.

the abandoned Andros forts, calling it Fort George.<sup>10</sup> Four year later they sponsored the construction of Fort Richmond a few miles up the Kennebec to further protect their new settlements.<sup>11</sup> At the same time, the Bay government constructed Fort St. George in present day Thomaston adjacent to Penobscot Bay.

The extended period of peace after Dummer's War encouraged the continued expansion of the frontier line, and with it a virtual boom in the building of forts. In the 1730's the government of Massachusetts attempted to block the northern invasion route into its growing western frontier by constructing two forts along the Connecticut river, Fort Dummer in present day Brattleboro, Vermont and a fort at Number Four, and in the 1740's covered the western approaches with Forts Shirley, Pelham and Massachusetts.<sup>12</sup> Number Four was the most Northern post and Massachusetts, situated on the Hoosic river which flowed into the Hudson river above Albany, the most exposed to the west. During

---

<sup>10</sup> James Phinney Baxter, ed., Documentary History of the State of Maine (Portland, ME, 1916), Collections of the Maine Historical Society, 2nd Series, Vol. XXIII, 234-50. The structure had originally been called Fort Andros. Fort George was dismantled in 1737. See Dunnack, Maine Forts, 232.

<sup>11</sup> Kershaw, The Kennebeck Proprietors, 19. Fort Richmond was enlarged in 1741 and dismantled in 1754 after Forts Western and Halifax were built further up the Kennebec. See Dunnack, Maine Forts, 240.

<sup>12</sup> Dummer was in present day Brattleboro, Vermont, and Number Four was to its north in Charlestown, New Hampshire. Fort Shirley was in Heath, Mass., Pelham in Rowe and Massachusetts in present day Adams.

King George's War New Hampshire forces also constructed a fort, called Atkinson after their commander, on Lake Winnepesaukee.<sup>13</sup> Throughout this period, numerous small forts built by communities or other interests, were erected along the northern Frontier, including Lovewell's fort built on Ossipee Lake, the defensive structure built by Scotch-Irish settlers at Penacook, New Hampshire,<sup>14</sup> and a small fort built at Gorham, Maine.<sup>15</sup>

The provincial forts presented almost a myriad of designs and sizes. Most used wood as their main construction element, but some forts, especially those near the coast, were substantial structures made of stone. Fort George in Brunswick, and Fort Mary in Saco were stone forts, as was Fort William Henry at Pemaquid. William Henry had an outside circumference of 737 feet and the wall fronting the sea was twenty-two feet high and six feet thick at the gun ports.<sup>16</sup> A round tower near the western side stood twenty-nine feet. The fort had twenty-eight gun ports and eighteen

---

<sup>13</sup> Potter, The Military History of New Hampshire, 83.

<sup>14</sup> Potter, The Military History of New Hampshire, 50-51.

<sup>15</sup> Hugh D. McLellan, History of Gorham, Maine (Portland, ME, 1903), 44-46.

<sup>16</sup> The east wall was twelve feet, North ten and the west wall eighteen. Variations in the ground, which is mostly ledge, accounted for some of the variance.

guns mounted, including six eighteen-pounders,<sup>17</sup> and usually had a garrison of sixty to one hundred.<sup>18</sup>

Forts built in the interior, such as the fort at Number Four and Fort Massachusetts, used logs as their main defense. The structure at Number Four had large, connecting buildings of horizontal hewn logs built almost in a square shape. A palisade of upright logs extended around most of the fort. Palisades built in this manner often did not have the logs touching each other with firing platforms as our folklore commonly depicts, but were actually planted several inches apart. In this case the palisade only kept the enemy at a distance, while the defenders fired from the buildings within.<sup>19</sup> The palisade of Fort Massachusetts had logs laid horizontally over a foundation of stone, the northeast angle protected by a watch tower. Inside the fort a large log house and several smaller structures which served both as barracks and blockhouses.<sup>20</sup>

Similar in construction, the fortification at Gorham, Maine typifies the small community fort. Built on the highest point of land, the principal structure was a

---

<sup>17</sup> This refers to the weight of the shot.

<sup>18</sup> Cotton Mather, Decennium Luctuosum (1699, reprinted in Charles H. Lincoln, ed., Narratives of the Indian Wars, 1675-1699, New York, 1913), 240-1: Wingate, "Ancient Pemaquid," Col Me Hist Soc, Vol XXIII, 282.

<sup>19</sup> An excellent reconstruction of Number Four exists in Charleston, New Hampshire.

<sup>20</sup> Herbert Milton Sylvester, Indian Wars of New England (Boston, 1910), Vol. III, 372.

building fifty feet long made of hewn logs surrounded by a palisade of timber with two flankers or watch towers. An excellent description of the palisade was provided in 1757 when the proprietors of the town voted to have it repaired. "Voted money, per foot for stockading the fort where the walls are defective, supposed to be one hundred feet, and to be done with spruce, pine, or hemlock timber, and the bark peeled off, and to be thirteen feet long and ten inches in diameter, to stand three feet in the ground and ten above, where the rocks will admit of digging three feet; and to be lined with six inch stuff, peeled as the other timber."<sup>21</sup> The difference in appearance between these small forts and the larger garrisons was very small, distinguished only by the fact that garrisons were privately owned, and the forts belonged to the community or the province. As the French wars progressed, and the frontier began to expand, it became the practice of the proprietors of new communities and the provincial governments to build a fort for the protection, not to mention the encouragement, of the settlers.<sup>22</sup>

The cost of construction of frontier forts, as well as the maintenance, could amount to a considerable burden. When the Pejepscot Company proposed to settle the communities of Brunswick and Topsham, they were ordered by the government not only to provide a fort for the safety of the settlers, but "for travelling backwards and forwards, for

---

<sup>21</sup> Mclellan, History of Gorham, Maine, 44-46.

<sup>22</sup> Baxter, ed., Doc. Hist. Me., Vol. XXIII, 244.



transporting Cattle &c, but most especially for facilitating the March of Forces to their relief in Time of War, A Road be made passable for Horse and Foot by Ferries, Bridges &c."<sup>23</sup> Arrangements for building the road and fort would be made by the proprietors, and the cost would be borne by the Bay government, however, despite the fact the shell of a stone fort built by Andros in 1688 remained, the proprietors understood the "House [of Representatives] inclinable to a Wooden Fort on account of the cheapness of it."<sup>24</sup> The directors of the Pejepscot company estimated the cost of a wooden fort, based on a similar one built a few years earlier at Winter Harbor, to be £500. "Rather than the Said Fort should be made of Wood, and so liable to be consumed by Fire," wrote the proprietors, "... We offer, that if the General Court will please to allow Five Hundred Pounds, and let us have the Fifteen Men, which are designed for that Garrison, we will enter into Engagements to repair and finish the aforesaid Stone Fort."<sup>25</sup> The fort, to be named "George", would be fifty feet square with four bastions or blockhouses, two made of wood "at our own charge", and barracks to house the garrison. The proprietors only asked that £300 be advanced to pay for materials.

The General Court agreed to this proposal and worked commenced on the fort. The final costs included: labor

---

<sup>23</sup> Baxter, ed., Doc. Hist. Me., Vol. XXIII, 240.

<sup>24</sup> Baxter, ed., Doc. Hist. Me., Vol. XXIII, 249.

<sup>25</sup> Baxter, ed., Doc. Hist. Me., Vol. XXIII, 249.

charges for masons, carpenters, smiths, laborers (mostly the fifteen provincial soldiers), and "Mr. Watts Boy cooking the pot"; materials such as shell lime, stone lime, over 10,000 feet of boards, pine plank, oak plank, glass casements, hinges, and a "large lock for the Gate"; provisions and drink; the hiring of sloops to transport materials; and "small expenses" including "1 horse lost", "loss and wear of tools", and £30 "allowed Mr. Watts his trouble."<sup>26</sup> The total cost for the completion of Fort George came to £688/9/4, of which the government of Massachusetts contributed £500 for the fort and £12/2 for the subsistence of the soldiers.<sup>27</sup>

Of course, Fort George was only a small installation, the cost of the larger provincial forts caused even more controversy, pitting colonies against the British government and against each other. After the close of King William's War the British government insisted Massachusetts replace Fort William Henry at Pemaquid which had been destroyed by the French in 1696. They believed the presence of a fort at Pemaquid helped to reassert the British claim to disputed territory and would discourage Indian incursions by covering the Kennebec, Damariscotta and Sheepscot rivers. The fort would thus become another strategic and political card in

---

<sup>26</sup> Watts not only provided his "boy" for a cook, but provisions and a sloop. The £30 must have been a bonus of some kind.

<sup>27</sup> Baxter, ed., Doc. Hist. Me., Vol. XXIII, 254-58.

their dealings with the French.<sup>28</sup> The Bay government balked at this order, however, as they felt the site offered little strategic advantage to justify the frightful cost involved. Lt-Governor William Stoughton wrote the London government on June 3, 1701 to voice the General Court's reservations. "As to the erecting of a Fort at Pemaquid, it is the general opinion of all who know the place that the Situation thereof is such as renders a Fortification there of very little or no use for the securing of our Plantations, nor can it be a bridle to the Indians, being far remote from any present Settlement of the English and lies much out of the Common road of the Indians the greatest numbers of which, that usually annoy us, having their Plantations and settlements on this side thereof."<sup>29</sup> Two months later the Governor's Council amplified their position by pointing out Fort William Henry had cost £40,000 to build and maintain, and, even though they had not been sure it accomplished anything, the government of Massachusetts had kept the fort supplied and garrisoned, only to have it fall into enemy hands and be destroyed. They could not now

---

<sup>28</sup> James Phinney Baxter, ed., Documentary History of the State of Maine (Portland, ME, 1907), Collections of the Maine Historical Society, 2nd Series, Vol. IX, 86; Samuel Adams Drake, The Border Wars of New England, Commonly called King William's and Queen Anne's Wars (1897, reprint of 1910 edition, Williamstown, MA, 1973), 84.

<sup>29</sup> Baxter, ed., Doc. Hist. Me., Vol. IX, 113.

support the cost of a fort so removed from the frontier.<sup>30</sup> The government of Massachusetts won this fight. Although Colonel Romer drew up plans for a new fort in 1699 and his successor, Colonel John Redknap did likewise in 1705, neither fort was ever built.<sup>31</sup> The British government even tried subtle blackmail by insinuating the further support of the colony as regards stores of war would not be as freely provided unless the Bay government rebuilt Pemaquid, but the tactic failed as the rebuilding effort got lost in other political controversy.<sup>32</sup>

Fort William and Mary in Portsmouth harbor, caused similar friction between governors and assemblies. When Governor Bellomont urged the building of a fort on Great Island in 1697, the New Hampshire Assembly agreed to listen to proposals, but they were astonished when the engineer Romer presented his construction estimate of £6000. The Assembly pleaded poverty and with the death of Bellomont,

---

<sup>30</sup> James Phinney Baxter, ed., Documentary History of the State of Maine (Portland, ME, 1907), Collections of the Maine Historical Society, 2nd Series, Vol. X, 99.

<sup>31</sup> Bradley, Maine's First Buildings, 11.

<sup>32</sup> "Council of Trade and Plantations to the Queen, November 7, 1704," Calendar of State Papers, Vol. 22, No. 645; "Queen in Council to Governor Joseph Dudley, January 11, 1705," Calendar of State Papers, Vol. 22, No. 806. In addition to rebuilding the fort at Pemaquid, Whitehall attempted to use these threats to force the Massachusetts Assembly to provide a salary for Governor Dudley, which they had steadfastly refused to do. When Dudley's name was connected to a scandal involving trade with the enemy, he apparently decided he had better drop the issue of a salary for awhile, and with it dropped the pressure to rebuild Pemaquid.

the project was put on a back burner until the commencement of Queen Anne's War.<sup>33</sup>

At that time the Assembly voted £500 in grain and other supplies, and £500 in labor provided by inhabitants pressed on a rotating basis who worked for their subsistence only. Unfortunately, the grain did not realize the price originally thought, and so the contribution was devalued to £450. In addition, Romer reported that the labor provided consumed far more than they worked. In November, 1703 he wrote "they had already consumed upwards of £26, and had not done £8 worth of work."<sup>34</sup> Though reported completed in 1705, the fort required constant repair and became a continuing source of friction concerning its maintenance costs. In July, 1708, George Vaughn, agent for New Hampshire, reported that the fort had never really been completed and was decaying because the province could not afford to pay for its upkeep.<sup>35</sup> In answer to a query from the Board of Trade, Romer agreed that the fort had never been completed. He said fishermen anchored off the island

---

<sup>33</sup> Potter, The Military History of New Hampshire, 21.

<sup>34</sup> "Minutes of New Hampshire Council in Assembly, December 7, 1703," Calendar of State Papers, Vol. 21, No. 1365.

<sup>35</sup> "George Vaughn to Council of Trade and Plantations, July 6, 1708," Calendar of State Papers, Vol. 24, No. 19. Vaughn said the fort was "builded and made of turff and saltmarsh sodds, which in a little time moulders and cannot endure the stormy weather and searching frosts of that countrey." Later in the same report he seems to contradict himself by reporting that "the condition of the Castle is tollerably well at the present so far as is finished but will yearly want repairs."

and stole the protective lead aprons off the cannon, and if they could do it the French certainly could. Romer said the garrison usually consisted of four men even though close to thirty cannon were mounted, "and in my time upon application made to the Governour there was ordered for a few days 16 men in time of some danger, then did the People universally complain ... and the fort was againe guarded as before by 4 decrepid men."<sup>36</sup>

The controversies and arguments over the support of William and Mary would continue throughout the French wars. In early February, 1740, Governor Jonathan Belcher upbraided the Assembly for its lack of financial support for William and Mary. "Fort William & Mary the only Fort of the province is in a pcor condition for defence and I shall in a few days lay the particular state of it before you when I hope you will do what may be necessary on your part that it may be sufficiently repaired and furnished with all warlike stores and with men and thereby render it capable of protecting the people and trade of the province. You are sensible, gentlemen, I have often recommended this matter to former assemblies whose answers have been that the people were not able to support this fort nor defray the other necessary charge of government."<sup>37</sup> In its reply the

---

<sup>36</sup> "Col. Wolfgang Romer's reply to Council of Trade and Plantations, August, 30, 1708," Calendar of State Papers, Vol. 24, No. 123. By this time Romer was back in England having been replaced by Redknap.

<sup>37</sup> Nathaniel Bouton, Documents and Records Relating to the Province of New Hampshire from 1738-1749 (Nashua, NH,

Assembly pointed out that this was "the first opportunity we have had of making any supply to the publick treasury or repair of the fort, since that ample supply made in the year 1737, in as much as your Excellency was pleased to dissolve the last General Assembly before the House had finished the Treasury accounts." However, they reiterated their contention that to support the fort to the extent that the governor wished, "we fear ... would be an insupportable burden to the people and we should bring upon ourselves a greater or more certaine misery than that which we pretend to remedy."<sup>38</sup> When Belcher sent his report on the condition of William and Mary, the Assembly sent its own inspection team to the fort a few days later to refute his contentions.<sup>39</sup>

At one point the British government attempted to have Massachusetts pay part of the cost for William and Mary, but the Bay government flatly refused citing New Hampshire's failure to support the defense of other areas.<sup>40</sup> The controversy here concerned the upkeep of another frontier

---

1871), New Hampshire State and Provincial Papers, Vol. V, 11-12.

<sup>38</sup> Bouton, ed., NHSP, Vol. V, 18-20.

<sup>39</sup> Bouton, ed., NHSP, Vol. V, 21-22.

<sup>40</sup> Jeremy Belknap, The History of New Hampshire (Reprint of 1831 edition, New York, 1970), Vol. I, 170; "William Vaughn to Council of Trade and Plantations, January, 1703," Calendar of State Papers, Vol. 21, No. 225. From the beginning New Hampshire insisted that Massachusetts help pay for William and Mary because they felt the fortification protected the town of Kittery across the harbor as much as it did Portsmouth.

fort, Fort Dummer on the Connecticut river. Built in a disputed area between New Hampshire and Massachusetts, Dummer was found to be in New Hampshire territory when the border was finally settled, so the Bay government naturally felt New Hampshire should pay for the fort. However, the New Hampshire Assembly refused, pointing out, with some justice, that Dummer gave very little protection to their communities, and, in fact, was designed to cover the Massachusetts towns to the south. In the end Massachusetts had to garrison and maintain both Fort Dummer and Number Fort to its north.<sup>41</sup>

The governments of Massachusetts and New Hampshire kept soldiers posted in their forts even in times of peace, although in most cases this involved only a token force.<sup>42</sup> Some forts, like St George, became important trading posts, or "truck houses", which required the presence of men to handle the lucrative Indian trade. Like those posted in garrison houses, however, soldiers stationed in forts between the wars tended to be pressed or hired men as few volunteered for such service.<sup>43</sup> Of course during declared

---

<sup>41</sup> Belknap, The History of New Hampshire, 286.

<sup>42</sup> Sylvester, Indian Wars of New England, Vol. III, 302.

<sup>43</sup> "Lt-Governor William Dummer to Timothy Dwight at Fort Dummer, Dec. 28, 1725," Massachusetts Historical Society, Misc. Bound: "Sir, Having concluded a Peace with the Indian delegates in behalf of the Western as well as the Eastern tribes that have been engaged in the late war You are hereby ordered forthwith to reduce the Garrison at Fort Dummer to a Corporal and fifteen centinals besides yourself ... You must in dismissing the Supernumary men, You must act without



wars the number of soldiers at provincial forts increased substantially, and often included not only the garrison, but men assigned to patrols and raiding parties.<sup>44</sup>

The normal tour of duty in a provincial fort was one year.<sup>45</sup> Any longer and the government would begin to receive complaints and petitions from the soldiers, their families or their communities demanding their release. The garrison at Fort Mary in Saco, Maine almost to a man petitioned the Bay government in 1704 to be released as they had "all been in the Service above 1 year".<sup>46</sup> But other soldiers became long term residents of the fort and even permanent members of the local community. For example, as part of its "Encouragements to enlist", the Pejepscot Company promised that any soldier who served at least six months at Fort George and desired "to become Inhabitants, we will endeavor to obtain a General Order from His Excellency the Governor to release them, they finding another man in their room, and when so dismiss they shall have One Hundred Acres of Land granted to each of them equall with the other Inhabitants."<sup>47</sup>

---

the least Partiality, Having a regard to the length of time they have been in the service, if their Volunteers or pressed (not hired) men"

<sup>44</sup> Baxter, ed., Doc. Hist. Me., Vol. IX, 161.

<sup>45</sup> Baxter, ed., Doc. Hist. Me., Vol. XXIII. 251-2.

<sup>46</sup> "A List of Men Belonging to Fort Mary at Saco, this 13 September, 1704," Maine Historical Society, Miscellaneous papers, Vol. I.

<sup>47</sup> Baxter, ed., Doc. Hist. Me., Vol. XXIII, 251-2.

For most who stayed, however, the lure was less spectacular. Their extended tour was simply the natural consequence of their chosen profession or particular assignment. The commanders, interpreters, gunsmiths, blacksmiths and even chaplains all had the potential for extended service at frontier forts - to become as gunsmith Ebenezer Nutting did while stationed at Casco Bay during Dummer's War, a "resident of Falmouth in the King's service."<sup>48</sup> Another gunsmith, Mark Rounds, had previously served at Falmouth during Queen Anne's War, and settled in the town after 1715.<sup>49</sup> John Gyles, a former captive of the Eastern Indians during King William's War, was stationed at the fort in Falmouth from 1700-1706 where he was chief interpreter for the Massachusetts government. Gyles later directed the construction of Fort George in 1714 and commanded that post until 1725 when he was commissioned for Fort St. George.<sup>50</sup>

When John March was appointed "Commander of Her Majesty's Fort at Casco-Bay, and Manager of the Trade for

---

<sup>48</sup> Dwight B. Demeritt, Jr., Maine Made Guns and Their Makers (Hallowell, ME, 1973), 6.

<sup>49</sup> Demeritt, Jr., Maine Made Guns and Their Makers, 3-4. For more on gunsmiths see Chapter Six.

<sup>50</sup> Baxter, ed., Doc. Hist. Me., Vol. X, 384; John Gyles, Memoirs of Odd Adventures, Strange Deliverances, &c. (Boston, 1736, facsimile reprint in The Garland Library of Narratives of North American Indian Captivities, New York, 1977), 41-44. - Of his experiences building Fort George, Gyles wrote "My Wages were very small, yet the Gentlemen-Proprietors ordered me only *Five Pounds* for my good service."

the Publick with the Indians there', he knew his stay might be protracted so "in Order to attend that service forsook his own habitation in Newbury and Removed his family, stock of Cattle and other Estate to the said fort." March would lose most of his possessions, including almost forty head of cattle, thirty-six pigs, twenty-five sheep, and almost twenty acres of crops, including "As good pese as ever I saw", in the Indian attack of August 10, 1703, although he and his family would remain safe within the walls of the fort.<sup>51</sup>

The presence of March's family in the fort at Falmouth was not unusual. Although certainly not an extensive practice, it was not uncommon for soldiers to bring their wives and children when posted at frontier forts. Women and children were present at Fort William Henry when it fell in 1696 and at Fort Massachusetts in 1746.<sup>52</sup> In assessing the disaster at William Henry Francis Parkman concluded that "the government of Massachusetts, with its usual military fatuity, had ... permitted some of the yeoman garrison to bring their wives and children to this dangerous and important post" and thus concern for the safety of the families led to the fort's quick capitulation.<sup>53</sup> However,

---

<sup>51</sup> Baxter, ed., Doc. Hist. Me., Vol. IX, 165-66.

<sup>52</sup> John Norton, The Redeemed Captive (Boston, 1748, facsimile reprint in The Garland Library of Narratives of North American Indian Captivities, New York, 1977), 4.

<sup>53</sup> Francis Parkman, Count Frontenac and New France under Louis XIV (Boston, 1896), 380.

although it certainly entered into the garrison's discussions, the failure of both William Henry and Massachusetts to withstand a siege involved far more compelling reasons than the presence of families.<sup>54</sup>

In addition to easing the pain of separation and reducing the problems of subsistence for poorer families while the husband was serving on the frontier,<sup>55</sup> wives and children may have helped the soldiers endure garrison life which consisted mainly of fatigue duty, watches and boredom. The journal of Lieutenant John Burk chronicling his stay at the fort at Number Four in New Hampshire from March 10 to May 14, 1748 provides an insight into the typical activities associated with garrison duty. The most constant chore, and the most dangerous, was the cutting and hauling of firewood from the surrounding forest. On March 11 they brought in eight loads of wood, on the 14th they hauled in or cut twelve loads, and on the following day they "got nine Load of wood and was out nine men of us for the tenth and last load which proved one too many for we was attacked by the Indians." The resulting ambush left one killed, one wounded and one captured, but the cutting of firewood had to continue.

Other chores proved less dangerous and more mundane. They brought in and installed a grindstone, repaired the hospital, built a privy and an oven, boiled soap and planted

---

<sup>54</sup> See Below.

<sup>55</sup> See Chapter Seven.

a garden, and made dugout canoes. On a more personal level, Burk made himself a chest "to put my things in" and on March 24 "made a pair of Indian shoes that was my days work." When not working or standing watch, diversions included wrestling, story telling and, for at least one man, heavy drinking, as Burk recorded that "Old father Summers got Drunk." Three weeks later Summers "broke" his back "playing ball" - unfortunately the exact nature of the game is unclear.<sup>56</sup>

Like garrisons, forts experienced shortages of food and clothing, especially those in the more remote areas.<sup>57</sup> The fort at Number Four was supplied by canoe from Fort Dummer, but occasionally the men rotated back to Massachusetts towns to replenish their supplies. In April, 1748, Burk and seventeen others went to Deerfield and Northampton where they bought forty pairs of shoes for the garrison and recruited another soldier. On a more personal level, Burk had his gun mended and purchased material to make seven shirts, three locks for his chest and a new rammer, or "gun stick", for his weapon.<sup>58</sup>

Soldiers at forts near population centers could moonlight, or take jobs in the community to supplement their income and fill the time. Usually these were odd jobs,

---

<sup>56</sup> "Journal of Lieutenant Burk," Stevens Family Papers, Special Collections, University of Vermont.

<sup>57</sup> Baxter, ed., Doc. Hist. Me., Vol. IX, 43.

<sup>58</sup> "Journal of Lieutenant Burk," Stevens Family Papers, Spec. Coll., University of Vermont.

cutting firewood or splitting shingles and clapboards, but soldiers with specific skills, such as gunsmiths or cordwainers could employ them for the benefit of the community and their own pocket books.<sup>59</sup> For the forts removed from frontier communities, there was no chance for moonlighting, and for them time could weigh very heavy. In the summer of 1746 a regiment, commanded by Colonel Theodore Atkinson, was raised in New Hampshire to participate in a planned assault on Canada, but the threat of a French invasion kept them close to home. Atkinson's regiment was stationed at William and Mary where they spent their time repairing the fort. With the collapse of the French invasion threat in October, the men of Atkinson's regiment were sent to lake Winnepesaukee to build a fort, which they named Fort Atkinson. Jeremy Belknap related that the soldiers were "plentifully supplied with provisions, and had but little exercise or discipline."<sup>60</sup> The men and officers were not allowed to disperse until orders came from England, which did not come for a year. Offenses were not punished, some hunted, some scouted and some, sick and tired of the soldier's life, deserted.<sup>61</sup>

Long tours of duty and the inevitable boredom of garrison life always made desertion a problem for post commanders. Faced with holding together a garrison rocked

---

<sup>59</sup> Baxter, ed., Doc. Hist. Me., Vol. XXIII, 252.

<sup>60</sup> Belknap, History of New Hampshire, 285.

<sup>61</sup> Potter, The Military History of New Hampshire, 82.

by the events of the Glorious Revolution, Sylvanus Davis had his share of troubles at Fort Loyal in 1689. When a pirate ship appeared in Casco Bay, seven men deserted for a life they felt would be more profitable and exciting, taking with them powder and shot from the fort, and various personal items belonging to other soldiers. Among the deserters was the fort's gunsmith, who took three guns and all his tools.<sup>62</sup> Wholesale desertions such as this were rare, however, as soldiers usually exercised more discretion by simply slipping away, or used more imagination like Benjamin Dower of Norwich who forged discharge papers in his commander's absence before he left Fort Mary in 1725.<sup>63</sup>

It should be emphasized that the problems associated with garrison duty were not restricted to New England provincial soldiers, but affected all armies of the eighteenth century. J. A. Houlding discovered that for British regiments "extended stay on a distant station was bound to have the most serious effect upon a unit."<sup>64</sup> Commanding officers in remote British forts were reluctant to discharge worn out men because replacements were rare, and there was a general relaxation of punishments and fatigue duty for fear of driving the men to desert. Allowing the soldiers to moonlight, while good for morale, decreased significantly

---

<sup>62</sup> Baxter, ed., Doc. Hist. Me., Vol. IX, 29-33.

<sup>63</sup> Baxter, ed., Doc. Hist. Me., Vol. X, 179.

<sup>64</sup> J. A. Houlding, Fit For Service: The Training of the British Army, 1715-95 (Oxford, 1981), 13.

the drill proficiency of the unit. In 1768 the Eighth Regiment of Foot arrived in Canada with 500 officers and men, and was dispersed to various forts on the frontier. In 1785 the regiment returned to England with 150 "very old men" and would not recover from its garrison duty for four years.<sup>65</sup>

Of course the presence of the enemy increased activity and certainly eliminated the problem of boredom. Local alarms, attacks on work parties or other evidence of enemy raiding parties resulted in increased watches and not a little anxiety. Sylvanus Davis kept his scouts out by land and water during the tense August of 1689, and "beat to arms" three times a day to prevent surprise.<sup>66</sup> When the new fort at Falmouth came under attack in 1703, the commander, John March, divided his command into three shifts of twelve men each and rotated them every two hours,<sup>67</sup> and the soldiers at Number Four doubled the guard whenever the behavior of their dogs indicated the possible presence of the enemy.<sup>68</sup>

---

<sup>65</sup> Houlding, Fit For Service, 13-17.

<sup>66</sup> Baxter, ed., Doc. Hist. Me., Vol. IX, 32-3. "Beat to arms" was a long roll on the drums which was the signal for soldiers to drop everything and fall in or take their assigned positions to prepare for attack.

<sup>67</sup> Samuel Penhallow, The History of the Wars of New England with the Eastern Indians (Boston, 1726; facsimile reprint, annotated by Edward Wheelock, Williamstown, MA, 1973), 7.

<sup>68</sup> "Journal of Lieutenant Burk," Stevens Family Papers, Spec. Coll., University of Vermont.



Naturally one of the primary purposes of the forts was to defend against attack, and on numerous occasions throughout the early French wars provincial soldiers had to withstand sieges. Only one, the capture of Fort William Henry by Pierre Lemoyne d'Iberville in 1696, could be considered a formal siege in the European style. For the French, according to d'Iberville's biographer, Fort William Henry "was a powerful structure, capable of overawing the Indians and keeping them loyal to the English."<sup>69</sup> D'Iberville had at his command three warships, 200 French soldiers and sailors, over 500 Indians and several pieces of artillery, including at least two mortars and five field guns.<sup>70</sup> When asked to surrender, the fort's commander, Pascoe Chubb, replied that he would not yield the fort though "the sea was covered by French vessels, and the land with Indians."<sup>71</sup> D'Iberville established his batteries on the islands in the harbor and on the landward side of the fort, setting them with such skill that the defenders could only use one gun in reply, the others having no targets in their line of

---

<sup>69</sup> Nellis M. Crouse, Lemoyne d'Iberville: Soldier of New France (Ithaca, NY, 1954), 106.

<sup>70</sup> Crouse, Lemoyne d'Iberville, 105-11.

<sup>71</sup> Crouse, Lemoyne d'Iberville, 113; Wingate, "Ancient Pemaquid," Col Me Hist Soc, Vol XXIII, 290.

sight.<sup>72</sup> After one day of bombardment, Chubb surrendered William Henry.<sup>73</sup>

Most sieges on the Northern frontier were not so elaborate. They were informal affairs flavored by *petite guerre* and involved large Indian raiding parties who employed no artillery. Three principal methods of attack were used. The first tactic was intimidation. Usually, the enemy would display a show of force outside the walls to convince the defenders they had no hope. At Fort Massachusetts in 1746 "there appeared an Army of French and Indians, eight or nine Hundred in Number," related the Reverend John Norton, "who having surrounded the Fort on every Side, began with hideous Acclamations to rush upon the Fort, firing incessantly upon us on every side ... we suffered them to come up in a Body 'till they were within twenty Rods of us, and then we fired; upon which the Enemy soon betook themselves to Trees, Stumps and Logs."<sup>74</sup> At Fort Mary in 1695 the enemy force came into the open, planted the French colors and opened fire, but as the fort commander John Hill reported, "our bullets sune apoynted a new Ensigne for them: and [forced] thire Cullers to

---

<sup>72</sup> Drake, The Border Wars of New England, 111; Crouse, Lemoyne d'Iberville, 113.

<sup>73</sup> Crouse, Lemoyne d'Iberville, 114. Chubb was crucified for his action, but many historians, including Thomas Hutchinson and Francis Parkman, have concluded he could not have held the fort under the circumstances. For more on Pasco Chubb see Chapter Eight.

<sup>74</sup> Norton, The Redeemed Captive, 4.

Retreat."<sup>75</sup> This psychological pressure continued throughout the siege. John Norton wrote that the French and Indians "continued thus to fire upon us, until between eight and nine at Night; and then the whole Army (as we suppose) surrounded the Fort, shouted, or rather yelled with the most hideous Out-cries all around the Fort; this they repeated three or four Times: We expected they would have followed this with a Storm; but were mistaken."<sup>76</sup>

Once the besiegers believed they had presented the hopelessness of the situation, an invitation to surrender was issued, and duly answered by the English defenders in the negative. Expressed in heroic and colorful language, at least as recalled after the fact, these intrepid retorts did not normally come back to haunt and embarrass the speaker as did Pasco Chubb's hasty remarks at Fort William Henry. When a French officer demanded the surrender of the fort at Number Four in 1747, the commander, Phineas Stevens, refused, saying the fort had been entrusted to him and he would defend it with all his means.<sup>77</sup> John Hill at Fort Mary recalled that "About two a'clock: Cam two men with a flag of truce, I demanded thire bisnis thay answered Mounsere Capt demanded a surrender of the fort and that he would give boon quartier: and If we would not hee would battalle all night: I told them If that ware thire bisnes I

---

<sup>75</sup> Baxter, ed., Doc. Hist. Me., Vol. XXIII, 17.

<sup>76</sup> Norton, The Redeemed Captive, 6-7.

<sup>77</sup> Sylvester, Indian Wars of New England, Vol. III, 380-2.

should discors them onely with the musels of our guns."<sup>79</sup> Colonel Thomas Westbrook, in describing the siege of Fort St. George in 1722 to the Lt-Governor Dummer, wrote that the Indians repeatedly demanded the surrender of the fort, but the garrison shouted "they wanted no quarters at their hands. Daring them Continually to Come on and told them it was King Georges Lands and that they would not Yield them but with the Last Drops of their Blood."<sup>80</sup>

When intimidation failed, the besiegers sometimes attempted to mine under the palisade in order to collapse a section of the wall. This tactic never worked as planned. The Indians attacking the Fort at Falmouth in 1703, under French direction, spent two days and nights tunnelling from the shore of the bay toward the walls of the fort. In this instance the timely arrival of the provincial galley lifted the siege.<sup>80</sup> Almost twenty years later a similar attempt at undermining the palisades of Fort St. George was defeated when rains caved in the tunnels.<sup>81</sup>

The third tactic employed the use of fire against the wooden palisades of frontier forts, accomplished either by setting fire to out-buildings in hopes the flames would spread to the fort, or by pushing combustibles up to the

---

<sup>78</sup> Baxter, ed., Doc. Hist. Me., Vol. XXIII, 17.

<sup>79</sup> "Westbrook to Lt-Governor Dummer, Sept. 23, 1722," Maine Historical Society, Miscellaneous Papers, Vol. I.

<sup>80</sup> Penhallow, The History of the Wars, 8.

<sup>81</sup> Penhallow, The History of the Wars, 86.

walls.<sup>62</sup> In 1690 Sylvanus Davis finally surrendered Fort Loyal when the Indians managed to place a barrel of tar and other flammable material against the palisades.<sup>63</sup> The Reverend John Norton related that their sergeant prepared the defenders of Fort Massachusetts for possible fire attacks by ordering "that all the Tubs, Pails and Vessels of every Sort, in every Room, should be filled with Water, and went himself to see it done."<sup>64</sup>

During the attack on the fort at Number Four in 1747 the Indians set fire to a deserted cabin and the flames spread to the grass which in turn threatened the fort itself. Half the garrison maintained a covering fire while the other half fought the flames and doused the walls. They accomplished this feat by digging eleven trenches to the outside deep enough for a man to stand in and throw buckets of water on the outside walls. They not only stopped the threat from the grass fire but kept the walls wet all night to prevent further incendiary attacks.<sup>65</sup>

In most cases these tactics failed and the provincial forts defended themselves quite adequately. In fact, between the fall of William Henry in 1696 and the end of King George's War, only one major fort was lost to the

---

<sup>62</sup> As the Pejepscot Company correctly pointed out (see above), stone forts were less susceptible to this tactic.

<sup>63</sup> Drake, The Border Wars of New England, 52.

<sup>64</sup> Norton, The Redeemed Captive, 6.

<sup>65</sup> Sylvester, Indian Wars of New England, Vol. III, 380-2.

French and their Indian allies, and that fort, Massachusetts, beset by several hundred French and Indians, was defended by twenty-two men under the command of a sergeant, and half the command had been struck down by illness before the enemy arrived. Massachusetts held out for two days and only surrendered when their ammunition supply, which had been low when the siege began, reached critical levels.<sup>86</sup>

Historian John K. Mahon believed the provincial forts were not effective because "it was simple for the savages to pass between the strong points, raid the territory beyond, and slip away unharmed."<sup>87</sup> In one respect what Mahon said is true, the forts could not stop all the raids on the frontier, but then no defense could totally stop the small Indian raiding parties. However, to dismiss forts as ineffective does not agree with the overall picture. The provincial forts on the northern frontier provided a military presence and represented the authority of the English government, and thus provided an obvious political target for the French and Indians. They also threatened the line of retreat for larger raiding parties, especially those built on major invasion routes, such as the fort at Number Four. As a result, the French and Indians began sending their larger raiding forces against the provincial forts

---

<sup>86</sup> Norton, The Redeemed Captive, 8. Norton reported that when they decided to surrender only four pounds of powder remained in the fort.

<sup>87</sup> John K. Mahon, "Anglo-American Methods of Indian Warfare, 1676-1794," Mississippi Valley Historical Review, 45 (1958), 261.

rather than the New England communities. With the large parties expending their energies against forts like St. George, Number Four and Massachusetts, and the increased vigilance of English scouts, there was no successful major attack on a New England town after the destruction of Deerfield in 1704. Thus, though expensive to build and maintain, even in defeat and destruction the provincial forts were a magnet that drew the fury of large enemy raiding forces away from the frontier towns.

## CHAPTER FOUR

### PATROLS, PROBES AND RAIDS

Scouting was the most common military duty performed provincial soldiers, especially those from the frontier communities themselves. To the governments of northern New England, a "scout" referred to any armed force moving beyond the frontier line,<sup>1</sup> from local patrols marching among the towns to extended raids striking deep into Indian territory. Among the latter we can include the large forces striking at Indian villages or French settlements around the Bay of Fundy. Although sometimes referred to as expeditions, they were really no more than reinforced raiding parties - the scout in its ultimate offensive form and the principal weapon used against the Eastern Indians.

---

<sup>1</sup> James Phinney Baxter, ed., Documentary History of the State of Maine (Portland, ME, 1897), Collections of the Maine Historical Society, 2nd Series, Vol. V, 337. Although the term "ranger" has been prevalent since the Seven Years War, especially with the fame of Rogers Rangers, the use of that title to describe soldiers moving beyond or through a frontier line was apparently promoted by the British military during that last French war. There are rare references to provincial soldiers "ranging" the woods, but in all official documents the term "scout" is used as a designation.



The number and effectiveness of scouts did not remain static during the early French wars. Drawing on the experiences of King Philip's War, the use of defensive patrols protecting the immediate communities remained customary throughout the period, but the territorial limits and close proximity of enemy villages in that earlier conflict had not prepared New England for the demands of this new war. As a result the aggressive use of raiding parties, with a few exceptions, found limited success during King William's War. Military forces were drastically reduced in winter to save money, and provincial officers had to master the procedures and logistics of long distance marches. But by Queen Anne's War the use of scouts, both defensive and offensive, increased rapidly. Winter raids when the Indians were most vulnerable became routine, and increased patrols and scouts all year long kept the enemy off balance. During Dummer's War the aggressive use of large provincial forces marching against the Indian villages of Norridgewock and Pequawket eventually broke the power of these Eastern tribes, and the officers who led these raids became heroes to the frontier communities struggling for their existence. Scouts were the cardinal element of warfare on the northern frontier, the essence of *petite guerre*, and provided provincial soldiers, both officers and men, with their most significant martial education.

To "scout" means to observe the motions and obtain intelligence concerning an enemy,<sup>2</sup> but the *petite guerre* of the New World added a combat emphasis as well. Scouts can be identified as defensive or offensive by their primary goal and scope of operation. Defensive scouts operated "on the backs of the towns,"<sup>3</sup> or close to the frontier communities, and their mission involved four major objectives: first, they had to "observe the motions of the Enemy and give notice of danger to the Towns or farmes adjacent;"<sup>4</sup> second, protect the inhabitants while they performed their labors;<sup>5</sup> third, pursue the enemy after they had struck;<sup>6</sup> and

---

<sup>2</sup> The New Webster Encyclopedic Dictionary of the English Language (Chicago, 1970).

<sup>3</sup> Nathaniel Bouton, Documents and Records Relating to the Province of New Hampshire from 1738-1749 (Nashua, NH, 1871), New Hampshire State and Provincial Papers, Vol. V, 577; Baxter, ed., Doc. Hist. Me., Vol. V, 89-90, 125.

<sup>4</sup> James Phinney Baxter, ed., Documentary History of the State of Maine (Portland, ME, 1907) Collections of the Maine Historical Society, 2nd Series, Vol. IX, 6. The presence of enemy raiding parties, if discovered before an attack, was usually revealed by their tracks or campsites, but on at least one occasion a patrol stumbled on an Indian party in ambush. The Englishmen immediately opened fire but in the ensuing combat their commander was killed and seven others captured. See Charles Edward Banks, History of York, Maine (Boston, 1931-35), Vol. I, 319.

<sup>5</sup> In 1724 one provincial officer commanding soldiers posted around Haverhill and Dracut was told that "All the said soldiers on the East of the river must be employed in scouting round those towns on the out parts of them, so as to secure the inhabitants in their harvest time." - American Antiquarian Society, Mass. Col. 1629-1869, Box 3, Folder 11: Militia returns, Officers commissions and Misc. Papers 1696-1762, "Instructions to Colonel Tyng"; Similarly in 1744, the Government of New Hampshire ordered thirty men "for one month to scout, cover and

finally, ambush known trails and fords used by enemy raiding parties as well as "visit the Enemys usual fishing places where in probability they now are And upon your discovery ... you are to attack fight take kill and destroy them."<sup>7</sup>

These patrols on the backs of frontier communities were often a thankless task involving much fatigue and even more frustration. All officers commanding provincial scouts were required to submit a journal chronicling their activities to assure they had done their job correctly. While most journals are succinct and provide little detail on the methods employed and the experiences of the soldiers, a few relate in great detail the difficulties associated with scouts, and from them we can understand the frustration of patrol duty. For example, in April, 1746 a Sergeant Trott

---

assist the settlement at Canterbury and Contoocook, to help them save their grain, &c." - Bouton, NHSP, Vol. V, 247.

<sup>6</sup> See Chapter One for detailed information on pursuit of the enemy raiding parties.

<sup>7</sup> Baxter, ed., Doc. Hist. Me., Vol. V, 89-90.; Of course the very real danger existed that the provincials could themselves be ambushed. A scout of sixteen men from Fort St. George in 1724, led by Captain Josiah Winslow, grandson of Governor Winslow of Plymouth, took two whale boats and set out to ambush an area known to be a favorite water fowling site for the Indians up the St. George river. Finding the area unoccupied, they were returning to the fort when the Indians fired at them from both shores of the river and launched a reported thirty canoes in pursuit. Although the English managed to hold them off until night fall, casualties were heavy, including among the slain "that worthy young Gentleman" Josiah Winslow. See Samuel Penhallow, The History of the Wars of New England with the Eastern Indians (Boston, 1726; Facsimile Reprint, Annotated by Edward Wheelock, Williamstown, MA, 1973), 99-100, Notes 28.

led a patrol operating between North Yarmouth and Brunswick. Trott and his men guarded the inhabitants while they brought in timber, then investigated three alarms but could not discover their meaning. At one point his patrol, reinforced by the local militia, pursued an enemy raiding party,<sup>8</sup> and Trott recorded the typical signs of Indian activity found in the woods beyond the frontier. After picking up the reinforcements from North Yarmouth, they "followed the enemies tracks into the woods and came to their camps made with sticks covered with bark and marched upon their tracks about two miles further and found their fire place where their [sic] had lately been a fire, we marched about two miles further and found where they had had a fire, we marched on still about three miles further and came to the place where we supposed they camped the night before and saw three large fire places, and fifty-three spits to roast meat upon." Trott continued on the trail for a few more miles but ended the pursuit when the inhabitants ran out of provisions.<sup>9</sup>

Naturally weather could play havoc with patrols, causing extreme discomfort and even dangerous conditions. In May, 1724 Allison Brown led a patrol around Saco and encountered problems with inordinate amounts of water. "I went to the Inhabitants to know if they would get down their

---

<sup>8</sup> See Chapter One

<sup>9</sup> William Hutchison Rowe, Ancient North Yarmouth and Yarmouth, Maine, 1636-1936 (Yarmouth, ME, 1937), 98.

Logs," Brown wrote, "but they said they could not the river being so high." Brown and his men continued despite this setback and tried to investigate various reports of enemy activity, but the wet conditions made travel almost impossible. Brown reported that "the River is so overflowed and the woods so full of water that ther was no going unless the men waded to their middles over many brooks which wee were obliged to pass over some were so great that several men were obliged to swim over and cutt trees on each side to meet so that the rest might bring their provision over dry, the Swamps and Interval land was so overflown that 'twas leg deep as wee marchct."<sup>10</sup>

One year earlier Jeremiah Moulton of York led a patrol of provincial soldiers covering all the towns in southern Maine, and his journal provides perhaps one of the best descriptions of the constant marching and countermarching, ambushes, protection, and frustration involved with defensive patrols. Leaving Falmouth on May 6, Moulton's men marched to Wells where one man sprained his ankle and had to be left behind. On the 9th they marched through the woods on the "back of Wells", scouted around York on the 10th and at Berwick on the 11th when they heard two men had been killed by Indians. Moulton reported that "while I was after those Indians another scout of Indians killed a man at Wells and burnt a saw mill and 50,000 [feet] of boards, we pursued

---

<sup>10</sup> James Phinney Baxter, ed., Documentary History of the State of Maine (Portland, ME, 1916) Collections of the Maine Historical Society, 2nd Series, Vol. XXIII, 150.

them till night designing to pursue them the next day, but a violent storm of rain prevented it." On the 12th they waited out the rain then Moulton divided his scout sending ten men to patrol on the back of Salmon Falls while he marched the rest above Berwick. On the 14th of May Moulton took his half of the scout to Kittery to protect the judges of the Superior Court who were then sitting in session. On the 16th they took provisions and rested and on the following day scouted around York. On the 18th they headed to Ogunquit and then on to Wells.

... [we] scouted on back of Wells in hopes to find some of the Lurking Enemy lurking to take the people as they went to meeting but we found none of them although four of them was discovered by the Inhabitants while we were in the woods. ... on the 22 day we marched from Wells through the woods on the back side of York. Whilst we was in the woods we heard an alarm at Cape Neddick. We immediately struck through the woods to Cape Neddick expecting to have came upon the Enemy, but we missed of our Expectations for they told me they took the alarms from Wells. Immediately we marched to Wells when came there they told us the alarms came from Saco falls, and some of the inhabitants had seen two Indians. On the 23<sup>rd</sup> day we through the woods to York: on the 24<sup>th</sup> we Scouted on the heads of out fields while the inhabitants mended their fences: on the 25<sup>th</sup> Guarded and Scouted at the out mills while the

Inhabitants hauled their Lumber. The 26<sup>th</sup> Sabbath day: on the 27<sup>th</sup> we took provisions and sent a Scout of men to Kittery to guard an Express that was going to his honor ... on the 4<sup>th</sup> [of June] scouted on the back of Wells. The Inhabitants ... having a Great number of board at their mill at Merriland, which Lyeth between Wells and Berwick, and thinking ever day ... the Indians would burn them, and [so] by their Request and it being a very likely place for to meet the Enemy we Lay in ambush about said mills while the Inhabitants wrought with about Two hundred men till the 14<sup>th</sup> day of June. We discovered where eight of the Indians had placed themselves by the road to have shot on the teams, but our Scouts which went on each side of the same Some distance from the road for fear of surprise. They coming on, said Indians start up and Run. Our Scout pursued them but the woods being so thick we could not have a shot at them: ... on the 19<sup>th</sup> we divided our Scout into three parts and waylaying in the Edge of the woods above Salmon Falls, the Inhabitants of Berwick went to work in their out fields while we Lay in ambush. Made no discovery but tracked ten of them which had gone a few days before: on the 20<sup>th</sup> we also divided in to three parties, Two parties of them waylayed on the heads of the fields while the inhabitants wrought in their out fields about their corn: myself with the other party Lay in ambush about

three miles above Berwick where the Indians used to pass from Berwick to Dover ... on the 25th Captain Harmon Took the Scout ... Sir Since this I have been Constantly Scouting with Captain Harmon, his Lieutenant being sick.

Despite the obvious exertions required in this type of patrol, and despite the frustrations of missed opportunities to strike the enemy, Moulton was able to conclude his report by stating unequivocally "I choose marching Rather then Lying in garrison."<sup>11</sup>

While defensive patrols may seem complicated with their simultaneous objectives of warning, protection, pursuit and ambush, offensive raids can be viewed in rather simple terms - they were intelligence gathering probes and search and destroy missions. The New England governments received intelligence from various sources. Some information was gleaned from casual conversations with Indians at truck houses, which reinforced the importance of having interpreters always posted at those trading establishments. In July, 1703, Indians visiting the truck house at Dunstable mentioned they had observed 150 Indians assembled in Canada along with a force of Frenchmen. Other Indians reported the

---

<sup>11</sup> "Journal of Jeremiah Moulton, May, 1723," Massachusetts Archives, Vol. 38A:21. Because of the significance of this entry in depicting patrol duty, I have altered the original spelling and construction considerably. There were few punctuation marks, and even fewer correctly spelled words. De-cyphering such writing would have detracted from its impact.



Pequawket and Penacook Indians had brought together their warriors and only waited for a force from Norridgewock before they made a massive attack on the English settlements. In this particular instance the news was all too accurate. Despite the fact that scouting parties were dispatched to "make discovery of the approach of the enemy and observe their motions," a large force of French led Indians launched a massive attack on the Maine settlements in early August.<sup>12</sup>

Intelligence concerning major French operations came from London and from other colonies. For example, Peter Schuyler of New York, taking advantage of his close relations with New York and Canadian Indian tribes, passed along any information that might affect New England. In June, 1708, Schuyler reported to Governor Joseph Dudley of Massachusetts that a large force of French and Indians were preparing to descend on the towns along the Piscataqua river. With this information corroborated by Indian scouts, Dudley raised 2,000 soldiers for the frontier in garrison and on patrol, and put half the militia on alert.<sup>13</sup>

---

<sup>12</sup> "Minutes of Massachusetts Council, August 11, 1703," Calendar of State Papers, Colonial Series, America and West Indies, December 1, 1702-1703 (Reprint of 1913 edition, Vaduz, 1964), Vol. 21, No. 989, 1025. In addition to these chance conversations, the government of Massachusetts occasionally sent friendly Indians to Canada as deliberate spies.

<sup>13</sup> Samuel Adams Drake, The Border Wars of New England. Commonly called King William's and Queen Anne's Wars (1897, reprint of 1910 edition, Williamstown, MA, 1973), 24-1; "Governor Joseph Dudley to Council of Trade and Plantations, March 1, 1709," Calendar of

Despite the reports of friendly Indians and other outside sources, the most common method of gathering intelligence, especially concerning the Eastern Indian tribes, were small companies of soldiers sent on deep probes into Indian territory.<sup>14</sup> Provincial soldiers scouted the lands of the Penacook Indians around Lake Winnepesaukee, the Pequawkets at the head of the Saco, and the Norridgewocks on the Kennebec. They sought signs of large Indian parties on the move, evidence of planting activities, and the location of fishing and hunting areas. Early in Queen Anne's War frequent probes sent by Governor Dudley revealed that the Indians had apparently abandoned their villages and removed their tribes to the protection of the French in Canada.<sup>15</sup>

---

State Papers, Colonial Series, America and West Indies, June, 1708-1709 (Reprint of 1922 edition, Vaduz, 1964), Vol. 24, No. 391. The French had half their Indians desert before they left, and another large number of Abenakis never arrived at the rendezvous at Lake Winnepesaukee. The reduction of their numbers forced them to change targets and attack Haverhill.

- <sup>14</sup> For example, New Hampshire Governor Benning Wentworth ordered Benjamin Mathews in 1745, "to Inlist nine Effective men and ... march them forthwith to Newicwannock river above the Mast men and from thence You are to march to Winnipisseake pond, and after Scouting to the Northward of the pond a day or two, You are to return to Newicwannock river and to Continue Scouting ... if it should happen that you make any discovery of the Enemy, you are Immediately to return and Express an Account thereof to me." See Isaac Hammond, ed., *Miscellaneous Provincial and State Papers* (Manchester, NH, 1890) *New Hampshire State and Provincial Papers*, Vol XVIII, 214.
- <sup>15</sup> "Governor Joseph Dudley to Council of Trade and Plantations, March 10, 1705," *Calendar of State Papers, Colonial Series, America and West Indies, 1704-1705* (Reprint of 1916 edition, Vaduz, 1964), Vol. 22, No. 947.

As Dudley wrote the Board of Trade, the Indians "complained the French cannot sustain them in their own country."<sup>16</sup> Dudley believed the Eastern Indians left their lands principally because of the frequent raids sent into their territory by the New England governments.

These raids were nothing less than search and destroy missions, and their purpose was threefold: to disrupt the economy of the Eastern Indians; to intimidate the raiding parties with the presence of provincial soldiers on their invasion routes; and to destroy warriors through ambush and battle. The commanders of these raids were apprized of these goals through simple but explicit instructions, such as those delivered to Captain Samuel Willard in 1725. Ordered to scout to Pequawket and then down the Kennebec and Androscoggin rivers, Willard was to, "Kill, Take and Destroy to the utmost of your power all the Enemy Indians you can meet in your March, and Search for their Corn, destroying all you can find."<sup>17</sup>

Of course strategies are generally easier to devise than to execute, and so it was in the case of the provincial raids. Of the three major goals the disruption of the Indian economy proved the easiest to achieve.<sup>18</sup> The Eastern

---

<sup>16</sup> "Governor Joseph Dudley to Council of Trade and Plantations, March 1, 1709," Calendar of State Papers, Vol. 24, No. 391.

<sup>17</sup> Annals of Lancaster, Massachusetts, 1643-1825 (Clinton, MA, 1884), 226.

<sup>18</sup> Francis Jennings, The Invasion of America: Indians, Colonialism, and the Cant of Conquest (New York, 1976),

Indians depended upon hunting and fishing to provide for their subsistence, and specific locations within the tribe's territory became associated with water fowl or shellfish.<sup>19</sup> Through casual conversations with the Indians, the observation of previous scouting parties, and the experience of their own hunters and fishermen, the provincial governments knew the locations of these areas and regularly ordered their commanders to scout and ambush them "to keep the Indians from their fishing and planting, to distress them farther against winter."<sup>20</sup>

Provincial raiding parties also sought to discourage French and Indian forces by their presence. The old raider Benjamin Church was very deliberate in his attempts to intimidate the enemy. During his 1690 raid into Maine Church left messages at one destroyed village telling the Indians who had done the deed and threatened his return if they did not reform. His force also killed several Indians and took captive the wives of some important chiefs.<sup>21</sup>

---

19. As Jennings pointed out, the strategy of destroying food supplies was common among European commanders.

<sup>19</sup> Jennings, The Invasion of America, 61-67.

<sup>20</sup> James Phinney Baxter, ed., Documentary History of the State of Maine (Portland, ME, 1907) Collections of the Maine Historical Society, 2nd Series, Vol. X, 199, 280; "Governor Joseph Dudley to the Council of Trade and Plantations, April 20 1704," Calendar of State Papers, Vol. 22, No. 260. The quote concerns a force of 700 men that Dudley was preparing to send along the coast from Casco Bay to St. Croix which would be Benjamin Church's last raid, see below.

<sup>21</sup> Thomas Church, The History of the Great Indian War of 1675 and 1676 Commonly called Philip's War, also, The

Church's bravado probably had little effect, but the capture of the sachem's wives may have been instrumental in forcing the Indians into a temporary truce that November.<sup>22</sup> However, such opportunities for direct intimidation were rare. At the very least the English hoped the evidence of large parties scouting the woods would create second thoughts among enemy raiders.

Determining if these efforts accomplished their purpose can be difficult. When intimidation succeeded, there were no attacks, but there is no difference between successful intimidation and simple inactivity on the part of the enemy. In both cases nothing happens. Despite this percipient problem, there is evidence to indicate provincial presence in the woods achieved results. Samuel Penhallow related that in 1704 when a French deserter warned of an approaching force, "Expresses and Scouts were every way sent to observe their motions." A large part of the enemy party fell to arguing and turned back, and when the reduced force sent their scouts ahead, they found the English "as thick as the Trees in the Woods." This news discouraged the party

---

Old French and Indian Wars, from 1689 to 1704 (Hartford, Conn, 1845 edition, orig. pub. 1716), 184-5; Cotton Mather, Decennium Luctuosum (1699, reprinted in Charles H. Lincoln, ed., Narratives of the Indian Wars, 1675-1699, New York, 1913), 225-6; Drake, The Border Wars of New England, 67-69. Church ordered the execution of his prisoners, see Chapter Twelve for more details.

<sup>22</sup> Howard H. Peckham, The Colonial Wars, 1689-1762 (Chicago, 1964), 42.

causing most of the remainder to desert.<sup>23</sup> Eight years later a scout of New Hampshire soldiers found where bark had been peeled off of trees, and continuing along the trail "Immediately came upon the Wigwams in a very obscure place" numbering seventeen in all. However, the Englishmen were convinced the Indians had been scared off by the presence of so many scouts in the woods because the wigwams had never been occupied.<sup>24</sup>

Of course, the reports of the enemy intimidation may represent an overly optimistic conclusion on the part of the New Englanders. In assessing the results of Church's raid along the coast in 1704 for the Board of Trade, Governor Dudley reported that "we are every day advised that what the forces of this Province did there against the enemy was of great value, and hath been such a discouragement to the French and Indians that for 5 moneths past my marching partys in the desert can find no footsteps of them."<sup>25</sup> How much of this statement is true or how much is wishful thinking on the part of Dudley is impossible to know.

The final purpose of the raiding parties, the killing of Indians through ambush, proved to be the most difficult as well as the most hazardous. Indian fishing and hunting grounds, fords and warrior paths, as well as the villages

---

<sup>23</sup> Penhallow, The History of the Wars, 23-24.

<sup>24</sup> Baxter, ed., Doc. Hist. Me., Vol. IX, 223-4.

<sup>25</sup> "Governor Joseph Dudley to the Council of Trade and Plantations, March 10, 1705," Calendar of State Papers, Vol. 22, No. 947.

themselves were all targets for ambushade or attacks, but the provincial forces rarely found their foe where they expected.<sup>26</sup> Although provincial soldiers experienced some success in this regard, to "search out and destroy the enemy" was indeed easier said than done.<sup>27</sup> In addition, like defensive patrols, the very real possibility existed that the English scouts themselves could be ambushed. In 1690 a scout under Captains Floyd and Wiswell were following a trail when they ran into an ambush near Wheelright pond in present day Lee, New Hampshire. An engagement ensued which lasted several hours and cost the lives of fifteen Englishmen, including Captain Wiswell.<sup>28</sup> A scouting party from Northampton ran into a similar ambush in 1704, losing one killed and two captured,<sup>29</sup> and in 1748 a Captain Hobbs and forty men were ambushed near Hinsdale, New Hampshire and lost three dead and four wounded after a sharp three hour battle.<sup>30</sup>

The success or failure of raids into enemy territory depended on many factors, including the quality of the

---

<sup>26</sup> Baxter, ed., Doc. Hist. Me., Vol. X, 280, 199; Baxter, ed., Doc. Hist. Me., Vol. IX, 474.

<sup>27</sup> Church, The History of the Great Indian War, 158. See accounts of Benjamin Church, Winthrop Hilton, Shadrach Walton and John Lovewell below.

<sup>28</sup> Jeremy Belknap, The History of New Hampshire (Reprint of 1831 edition, New York, 1970), Vol. 1, 221-2; Mather, Decennium Luctuosum, 223-4.

<sup>29</sup> Drake, The Border Wars of New England, 206-7.

<sup>30</sup> Belknap, The History of New Hampshire, 295.

commander and the soldiers, the weather, logistical support, and the guides or "pilots" who led the scouts into the mountains and forests. The provincial governments used local inhabitants, hunters, Indians and former captives to pilot their raiding parties. In 1722 Colonel Thomas Westbrook used four redeemed captives for guides and intelligence concerning location of the enemy.<sup>31</sup> Two years later he employed Stephen Hardin as pilot, "an Expert one on Saco Kennebunk and all the rivers as far as Winipeesiaucut Ponds he having hunted on that ground for many years past, He was Pilot to Lieutenant Johnson Harmon on his last march who says he never saw a man have more Judgment in the woods than he."<sup>32</sup> Another famous Maine hunter who guided provincial raiding parties was Richard Hunniwell. Listed as pilot for the March-King raid in 1691, he was wounded in the famous beach fight which ended that disastrous scout.<sup>33</sup> Four years later he appeared "ready and willing" to pilot a scout commanded by Pasco Chubb.<sup>34</sup>

---

<sup>31</sup> Baxter, ed., Doc. Hist. Me., Vol. X, 155

<sup>32</sup> Baxter, ed., Doc. Hist. Me., Vol. X, 203-4.

<sup>33</sup> Baxter, ed., Doc. Hist. Me., Vol. V, 280-1. For more on March-King raid, see below.

<sup>34</sup> Baxter, ed., Doc. Hist. Me., Vol. V, 426-7. Hunniwell was later killed from ambush in 1703 along with eighteen of his Black Point, Maine neighbors as they walked out to mow their fields. See Drake, The Border Wars of New England, 164-5.



Friendly Indians were also frequently used as guides.<sup>35</sup> One Mohawk named Christian guided many scouts during Queen Anne's and Dummer's Wars, including the great raid on Norridgewock in 1724.<sup>36</sup> Of course being a hunter, Indian or former captive did not guarantee a pilot could always find the destination, as John March found out in 1703 when his massive raiding force of 360 men never approached their target due to the confusion of the guides trying to follow overgrown trails.<sup>37</sup> Thomas Westbrook experienced the same disappointment in 1724 when the ineptitude of his pilots ruined his designs.<sup>38</sup>

In addition to the quality of the pilots, difficulties in the procurement of provisions could create serious problems for long range scouts. Food and replacement clothing had to be gathered and prepared, and then transported by the soldiers, usually in knapsacks ("snapsacks"). Smaller scouts could also hunt as they marched, and, like their French and Indian counterparts, New England soldiers became adept at procuring game.<sup>39</sup> A

---

<sup>35</sup> This despite the fact Cotton Mather suspected some of them were passing information to the French. See Mather, Decennium Luctuosum, 203.

<sup>36</sup> Christian died "with a violent bleeding" on a scout heading up the Merrimack in 1725. See Annals of Lancaster, 225; Baxter, ed., Doc. Hist. Me., Vol. X, 272.

<sup>37</sup> "Minutes of Massachusetts Council, August 23, 1703," Calendar of State Papers, Vol. 21, No. 1144.

<sup>38</sup> Baxter, ed., Doc. Hist. Me., Vol. X, 226.

<sup>39</sup> Baxter, ed., Doc. Hist. Me., Vol. X, 21.

company under John White and Seth Wyman, which left Lancaster in July, 1725 and scouted in New Hampshire for about a month, augmented their stores with several bears and a black moose. They also killed "divers Rattle snakes, which pestered us very much in our march."<sup>40</sup> Earlier that same year a scout under the command of John Lovewell reportedly "were well entertained with Moose, Bear, and Deer; together with Salmon Trout, some of which were three feet long, and weighed twelve pounds apiece."<sup>41</sup>

While hunting and fishing did supplement the food supplies of smaller parties, success was haphazard at best. Game animals can prove scarce during certain times of the year and under some weather conditions, and larger groups of men moving through the woods had a tendency to drive the game before them. Under most circumstances, therefore, raiding parties had to husband their supplies for the duration of the scout. But even with strict frugality and careful conservation unforeseen shortages could force the termination of a scout and endanger the health of the soldiers. On many occasions raiding parties and scouts returned to the settlements in a ragged, starving and sick condition. The soldiers March-king raid of 1691 arrived in Portsmouth in a "shattred Condition (some haveing lost their Guns and maney their Shoes and stockins)," and were thus

---

<sup>40</sup> Annals Of Lancaster, 231-33.

<sup>41</sup> Penhallow, The History of the Wars, 110. Apparently "fish stories" have not changed much over the centuries.

considered fit only for garrison duty.<sup>42</sup> A raiding party led by Thomas Westbrook in 1724 had to be terminated early when some of the men lost their bread while wading through the rivers and streams swollen by recent rains.<sup>43</sup>

Shortages of food was a hazard all soldiers experienced when they marched into the woods of New England - the New Englanders were not exceptional in this respect. A major French raid against the western Iroquois in 1684 found their provisions short due to mismanagement in transportation and as a result many of the soldiers fell dangerously ill.<sup>44</sup> In 1747 a force of apparently starving French and Indians laid siege to the fort at Number Four. After several attempts to burn the walls, the French called a parley and the French officer demanded that food be gathered for his men even before asking for the fort's surrender. When refused, the French officer became quite agitated and began shouting threats about taking the fort by storm and the likely consequences of that action. The fort commander, Phineas Stevens, broke off the talks and the siege resumed. After a while the French called for another parley and suggested to Stevens that if he sold them some food they would go away. Stevens declined this business transaction and after firing

---

<sup>42</sup> Baxter, ed., Doc. Hist. Me., Vol. V 292-3. See Chapter Two.

<sup>43</sup> Baxter, ed., Doc. Hist. Me., Vol. X, 226.

<sup>44</sup> Francis Parkman, Count Frontenac and New France under Louis XIV (Boston, 1896), 104.

a few more shots in frustration, the French force moved off to find provisions elsewhere.<sup>45</sup>

Weather obviously also played a role in the success or failure of a scout. A heavy downpour forced soldiers to halt their march in order to protect their food, powder and weapons, and prolonged rain not only created swollen rivers, as in the Westbrook raid, but often produced illness among the men.<sup>46</sup> The White-Wyman scout in July, 1725, encountered heavy rain on the 17th which forced them to halt their march, then another rain storm hit them on the 20th, by which time several of the men were ill. Two days later White reported that "Several more of our men were taken ill with a Bloody Flux, which we Suppose was occasioned by Excessive Rains and Immoderate Heats." The march continued, despite the prevalence of sickness within the company, until the 26th when rain once again forced a halt, "our men continuing sick." The next day found "the Storm continuing, and our men growing worse we lay still all day." When the storm passed, White and Wyman led their men home.<sup>47</sup>

Because of the physical demands placed on offensive scouts, officers employed only the best soldiers available to them. In 1695 Major Charles Frost of Kittery informed

---

<sup>45</sup> Herbert Milton Sylvester, Indian Wars of New England (Boston, 1910), Vol. III, 380-2. See Chapter Three for more details on this siege.

<sup>46</sup> Baxter, ed., Doc. Hist. Me., Vol. IX, 141; Annals of Lancaster, 241.

<sup>47</sup> Annals of Lancaster, 233. For more on the consequences of sickness see Chapter Eleven.

the Bay government that the raiding party he had dispatched up the coast of Maine "are well fixt with armes: and are the best of all souldiers,"<sup>48</sup> and Johnson Harmon, returning from a scout up the Saco river in 1723, reported that "the 120 men that I have the Honour to Command [are] most of them Old Experienced Souldiers."<sup>49</sup> Benjamin Church recommended that soldiers employed on raids "be men of good reason and sense to know how to manage themselves in so difficult a piece of service as this Indian hunting is, for bad men are but a clog and hinderance to an army, being a trouble and vexation to good commanders, and so many mouths to devour the country's provision, and a hinderance to all good action."<sup>50</sup>

Offensive scouts varied greatly in size, from a handful of men to large companies numbering several hundred. But all operated on the march, or at least were supposed to operate, in a similar manner. As the main party followed a trail or a river, smaller scouts would be constantly detached to investigate signs of enemy activity and to prevent ambush.<sup>51</sup> The provincial governments often explicitly ordered that raiding parties and probes "take special care to avoid danger by ambusments, of being drawn

---

<sup>48</sup> Baxter, ed., Doc. Hist. Me., Vol. V, 431.

<sup>49</sup> Trask, William Blake Trask, Letters of Colonel Thomas Westbrook and others Relative to Indian Affairs in Maine, 1722-1726 (Boston, 1901), 11-12.

<sup>50</sup> Church, The History of the Great Indian War, 247.  
Presumably, these men were only fit for garrison duty.

<sup>51</sup> Baxter, ed., Doc. Hist. Me., Vol. IX, 140-43; Annals of Lancaster, 224-41; Mather, Decennium Luctuosum, 223-4.

under any disadvantage by the enemy in your marches, keeping out scouts and a forlorn hope before your main body."<sup>52</sup> The journal of a scout led by Captain John Cagon in September, 1722, provides an excellent example of how scouts were conducted. The purpose of the scout was to probe for signs of enemy activity on the Merrimack and up into the Penacook and Pequawket regions.<sup>53</sup> Leaving Dunstable on September 18, the scout travelled in canoes up the Merrimack river. On the 19th they overturned a canoe losing two cooking kettles and one gun, although "with much difficulty" they managed to recover the weapon. On the 20th they continued up the river, sending scouts along each bank to look for sign and possible ambush.

Everyday they continued this same pattern, the main body on the river in canoes with flanking scouts on each bank. On the 22nd they camped at the mouth of the Contoocook river where the returning scouts reported they had heard Indians "hallowing"<sup>54</sup> nearby. The next morning Cagon sent out three parties; one of seven men up the Contoocook, another seven to the "Wenopessocket" river, and two men sent "about the mountains." All the scouts reported finding no sign. That night they heard a gun shot up the Contoocook, and, quickly seizing their weapons, left camp to investigate

---

<sup>52</sup> Church, The History of the Great Indian War, 158.

<sup>53</sup> Cagon's description of the terrain over which they travelled, and their campsites, is so detailed it is almost possible to follow their exact route on a modern map of New Hampshire.

but found nothing. Cagon spent the next day camped at the Contoocook as well, sending scouts up the rivers again with the same negative results.

On September 25 they left the Merrimack and headed up the "Wenopessocket" river. As they neared present day Laconia, their scouts found the tracks of some Indians who had been hunting a bear. Cagon immediately dispatched more scouts but they found no further sign. On the 28th they put their canoes in Lake Winnepesaukee and crossed to the Northeast side where they proceeded on foot toward Ossipee and the trail to Pequawket. At Ossipee Pond they discovered the tracks of another force of Englishmen, and "being discouraged" because this party was ahead of them, they retraced their steps back to Winnepesaukee. High winds buffeted their canoes as they crossed the lake "(but by the goodness of God) we all got safe over a little before it was dark." They passed down the river (at present day Weir's Beach) and camped on an island. On their return to the Merrimack they discovered more tracks which appeared to be hostile, but on closer examination Cagon and his men determined they were English. On October 2 they camped at Suncook falls and arrived in Dunstable on the 3rd.<sup>54</sup>

A similar scout in 1707, using the same techniques, encountered much different results. In early February, Lieutenant Seth Wyman led his men into New Hampshire to the

---

<sup>54</sup> "Journal of Captain John Cagon," Massachusetts Archives, Vol 38A:19,20.

area around Monadnock Mountain. When they awoke on the morning of the 6th, the company gathered wood for fires to cook breakfast and warm themselves in the winter air. Wyman ordered two scouts of four men each to check for sign, sending one to the right and one to the left. He admonished them to be particularly careful not to confuse the sounds of their own company's hatchets with the enemy. "After they had bin upon the Scout about an hour, [he] Saw both Scouts returning together, running towards our Camp as men affrightened, and called to me at a distance to put out our fires, for they had discovered a Body of the Enemy." The right scout had indeed heard the sound of hatchets, and making a wide circle to make sure they were not their own men, came on a camp. The corporal approached the unknown force hidden in the smoke of their fire and heard voices which he believed were French and Indian. The corporal pulled his men back and, meeting up with the other scout, ran to warn their company. As Wyman conferred with his officers over a plan of action he found his anxious men crowded around him. "He bid them move off, Scatter, and stand on their own Guard, upon which three quarters of our men ran away homewards." The end result was a court martial for "a false report ... of the discovery of the Indian Enemy ... and for their returne home, in a mutinous disorderly manner."<sup>55</sup>

---

<sup>55</sup> Samuel A. Green, Groton During the Indian Wars (Groton, MA, 1883), 98-101. For more on this incident see Chapter Nine.



The ability to perform long range offensive scouts was a skill honed throughout the early French wars, but Queen Anne's War proved to be pivotal in the development of those techniques which produced efficacious offensive raids and probes. During King William's War the ineffective use of deep probes and large raids can be attributed largely to inexperience. The employment of defensive patrols easily carried over from the earlier Indian wars, especially King Philip's, but the large raids undertaken in those earlier conflicts had been against adjacent targets. The experiences of King Philip's War did not anticipate the military complications of the French wars, and as a result the initial martial efforts of Massachusetts and New Hampshire achieved little success.<sup>56</sup> The provincial governments of New England and their soldiers found that offensives against enemy targets in the French wars would require longer marches and greater logistical problems. They were required to develop new strategies and tactics for this new kind of war, and the lessons would prove painful and frustrating.

In particular, the large raiding party led by John March and Daniel King in 1691 ended in disaster largely because of ignorance and misfortune. Ordered to clear the area north of the Merrimack river of the enemy before heading east "in search of the said Enemy French or

---

<sup>56</sup> For example, in 1690 Jeremiah Swain brought several hundred men to the Maine frontier but spent his time marching back and forth as a kind of giant patrol.

Indians,"<sup>57</sup> the raid almost immediately encountered difficulties. As March and King led their company from Haverhill through Exeter to Portsmouth, they were forced to leave a considerable number of their men at Greenland due to sickness and poor firearms. This loss threatened to end the raid before it really started, but they were able to make up their losses by enlisting men in New Hampshire and Maine, including a company commanded by Captain Samuel Sherbourne of Hampton.<sup>58</sup>

However, this inauspicious beginning only presaged further difficulties. As the force was leaving Portsmouth harbor they were fired on and detained by two alleged pirate ships. After providing depositions concerning the "herleburley with the Privateers,"<sup>59</sup> they finally sailed to Saco but found no evidence of enemy activity. March and King then took their company to Macquoit<sup>60</sup> and marched to Pejepscot. Finding no sign of the enemy once again, they returned to Macquoit and their waiting vessels. During the embarkation, a large party of Indians opened fire from ambush, killing or wounding many of the soldiers remaining on shore, including, among the slain, Captain Samuel

---

<sup>57</sup> Baxter, ed., Doc. Hist. Me., Vol. V, 261-3.

<sup>58</sup> Baxter, ed., Doc. Hist. Me., Vol. V, 264-70; Joseph Dow, History of the Town of Hampton, New Hampshire: From its Settlement in 1638, to the Autumn of 1892 (Salem, MA, 1893 [reprinted, Somersworth, NH, 1970]), 227.

<sup>59</sup> Baxter, ed., Doc. Hist. Me., Vol. V, 277.

<sup>60</sup> Freeport, Maine

Sherbourne. March and King managed to retrieve the remainder of the shore party and, after a long fire fight with the Indians on shore, brought their shattered command back to Portsmouth.<sup>61</sup>

The exploits of Benjamin Church provided an exception to the rather bleak record of offensive scouts during that first French war. Church was one of the few veterans of King Philip's War able to utilize his previous experience and adapt to the new larger kind of conflict. Using a combined force of about equal numbers of Indians and whites mostly recruited from Plymouth, Church participated in four major raids. The first in 1689 consisted principally of his arrival "in the nick of time" to help drive away an enemy force attacking the settlement at Casco Bay, an engagement known as the Battle of Brackett's Woods.<sup>62</sup> During the second raid in the Fall of 1690 Church landed at Macquoit, marched to the abandoned Fort Andros at Pejepscot and then up the Androscoggin to an Indian fort where he killed several Indians, captured some important Indian women and destroyed the structure. His officers at a council of war convinced him to end the raid so they returned to Macquoit and sailed to Casco Bay, now deserted after the French capture of Fort Loyal earlier that summer. While at Casco Bay he allowed his Indians to sleep on shore where they were

---

<sup>61</sup> Baxter, ed., Doc. Hist. Me., Vol. V, 280-3., Dow, History of Hampton, 227.

<sup>62</sup> Church, The History of the Great Indian War, 160-70; Drake, The Border Wars of New England, 39.

attacked by a force of French Indians. Church disembarked the rest of his command and drove the attackers away. On returning to Portsmouth he wanted to enlist more soldiers and continue the raid, but the Bay government, shocked at the debts incurred over the Quebec expedition, begged poverty and disbanded his command.<sup>63</sup>

The third raid in 1692 attempted ambushes around Penobscot Bay, and then proceeded up the Kennebec to Teconnet.<sup>64</sup> The Indians burned their village at his approach but he did manage to destroy considerable stores of corn. Four years later his fourth raid went along the coast of Maine and into the Bay of Fundy where he plundered and burned some French settlements. Superseded in command by a Lt-Colonel Hathorne, Church wanted to raid the principal Indian village at Norridgewock but Hathorne refused. The raid ended with a half-hearted attempt to take a small French fort and truck house on the St. John river.<sup>65</sup>

In all these raids Church utilized techniques that would become common in later wars. When he attacked the Indian fort on the Androscoggin in 1690, he had his men drop their knapsacks to free their movements, and then ordered "the captains to draw out of their several companies sixty of their meanest men, to be a guard to the Doctor and

---

<sup>63</sup> Mather, Decennium Luctuosum, 225-6; Church, The History of the Great Indian War, 180-93.

<sup>64</sup> Waterville, Maine

<sup>65</sup> Church, The History of the Great Indian War, 223-40; Drake, The Border Wars of New England, 113-14.

knapsacks."<sup>66</sup> Unattended packs invited ambush, as John Lovewell would later discover. Church also made extensive use of whaleboats in his raids. "Being farr nimbler then any pinnace, able to carry 15 men each being about 36 foot long, yet so light that two men can easily carry one of them," in the hands of his Plymouth men and the "whaling Indians" of Cape Cod they were an effective means of transportation for raiding parties along the Maine coast and on the waterways of the northeast, and "of so great use for surprizing of places and vessels in the night, their padles making no noise as oares do."<sup>67</sup>

While Church's raids achieved variable results, the significance is that he consistently put together forces and engaged in long distance offensive raids. With the exception of James Converse, who accompanied Church on his second raid and conducted an offensive scout to Teconnet in May, 1693, few English raiding parties penetrated far or accomplished much. There was also no uniformity in military coverage of the frontier as fiscal pressures compelled the drastic reduction of provincial forces during the winter to

---

<sup>66</sup> Church, The History of the Great Indian War, 184.

<sup>67</sup> "Francis Nicholson and Samuel Vetch to Earl of Sunderland, June 28, 1709," Calendar of State Papers, Vol. 24, No. 604. The quotes come from a report made by Samuel Vetch to the British government concerning the preparations for the supposed assault on Quebec in 1709. Church was raising a force of Plymouth Indians and promoting the use of whaleboats. His sales pitch worked as Vetch ordered thirty-five of the craft.

a handful of soldiers posted in garrisons.<sup>68</sup> Both the provincial governments and their officers had a great deal to learn, but enlightenment would come during Queen Anne's War.

That war began with the same inefficiency and misfortune which had dogged most provincial raiding efforts in the previous conflict. In late September, 1703 John March led 360 men on a raid to Pequawket "but through the difficulty of the Passage, and the unskilfulness of the Guides, they returned without Discovery."<sup>69</sup> Although March returned in November with 400 men and managed to kill six Indians and destroy some corn,<sup>70</sup> Governor Joseph Dudley reported to the Board of Trade in December that the distance to the Indian villages "is such that our provision is spent before we can get to their headquarters; the forces were out 12 daies each time and necessarily carried all their provisions in their snap-sacks, being unpassable for horses, and so were forced to return before they could come to Pequawkit."<sup>71</sup> Yet two years later Dudley was able to inform that same body he had

---

<sup>68</sup> Mather, Decennium Luctuosum, 203; Baxter, ed., Doc. Hist. Me., Vol. IX, 70.

<sup>69</sup> Penhallow, The History of the Wars of New England, 8; "Minutes of Massachusetts Council, October 14, 1703," Calendar of State Papers, Vol. 21, No. 1144.

<sup>70</sup> Penhallow, The History of the Wars of New England, 9; "Address to the Massachusetts Assembly by Governor Joseph Dudley, October 27, 1703," Calendar of State Papers, Vol. 21, No. 1201.

<sup>71</sup> "Governor Joseph Dudley to the Council of Trade and Plantations, December 19, 1703," Calendar of State Papers, Vol. 21, 1398.

kept out constant scouts, and that "the people are so sensible of the benefit they have by these hard marches, wherein no souldier has more subsistence for 25 dayes than he carrys out on his back besides his arms, that they are very patient of the service."<sup>72</sup>

Several developments in provincial strategy and tactics produced this change in attitude. First, the governments of Massachusetts and New Hampshire greatly increased the number of soldiers involved in patrols, probes and raids compared to King William's War. These "constant marches" kept the Indians away from their territories, forcing them to remove to Canada and thus increase the travel distance to the English frontier. By 1706 some of the leading citizens of New Hampshire and Maine involved in the mast trade were able to report to Whitehall, somewhat optimistically perhaps, that "the Indians in all the parts near us are beaten and burnt out of their forts, and their hunting and fishing destroyed to that degree that the husbandry and masting of this Province is secured and proceeds to as good effect as in time of peace."<sup>73</sup> In addition, the increased presence of provincial soldiers in the woods probably forced a change in French and Indian tactics from the larger forces of Frontenac's day to smaller parties which were less easy to

---

<sup>72</sup> "Governor Joseph Dudley to the Council of Trade and Plantations, January 1, 1707," Calendar of State Papers, Vol. 23, No. 691.

<sup>73</sup> "Gentlemen Concerned in Providing Masts to the Council of Trade and Plantations, February 14, 1706," Calendar of State Papers, Vol. 23, No. 113.

detect.<sup>74</sup> Finally, the augmented use of scouts provided much needed experience for provincial officers and men.

One of these "constant marches" in 1704 saw the last appearance of Benjamin Church in command of a field force. Church drew up a list of recommendations for the Bay government concerning this raiding party and long range scouts in general which provides some insight into his methods. He suggested all whaleboats be fitted with leather loops and poles so they could be lifted over rocks, that two brass kettles be sent with every boat to cook food, and that all soldiers wear "Indian shoes" to protect the whaleboats and canoes. Church further suggested that leather, hemp and wax be brought along to replace worn out shoes. The raiding party should also take hatchets or light axes, "made pretty broad", to widen carrying places for the whale boats. Church felt whalemens should be hired to run the boats, as long as they could be released for whaling in the fall.<sup>75</sup> Samuel Penhallow reported that it was the custom of the men under Church's command "to rest in the Day, and row in the Night; and never fire at an Indian if they could reach him

---

<sup>74</sup> The French found their Indians more reluctant to venture to the English frontier in larger parties because those that did often sustained casualties from the numerous patrols operating through the region. After Queen Anne's War larger enemy raiding parties usually focused their attention on the growing number of provincial forts. See Chapter Three.

<sup>75</sup> Church, The History of the Great Indian War, 245-9. For Church's recommendations concerning firearms, see Chapter Eight.



with a Hatchet, for fear of alarming them."<sup>76</sup> On this occasion Church again raided along the Maine coast and into the Bay of Fundy, the principle damage done being the burning of Grand Prè, the destruction of the dykes in that area, and the capture of French settlers to exchange for English prisoners.<sup>77</sup>

A second development which enhanced the effectiveness of offensive scouts was the inauguration of winter raids. In December, 1703, when he reported the inconclusive results of John March's raids of the previous fall, Dudley informed the Board of Trade that he was preparing his forces for a winter march on the enemy. According to his reports, both the Assembly and Council of Massachusetts showed reluctance to support his design, preferring to disband most of the provincial soldiers for the winter as they had always done in the past.<sup>78</sup> Dudley pushed forward his plan, however, and found some support in his northern colony. The New Hampshire Council and Assembly urged the use of winter marches as "it ever hath been judged the best season in the winter to go to the enemy's headquarters; they cannot be pursued so well in the Spring."<sup>79</sup>

---

<sup>76</sup> Penhallow, The History of the Wars of New England, 17.

<sup>77</sup> Church, The History of the Great Indian War, 165-85; Drake, The Border Wars of New England, 196-9.

<sup>78</sup> "Governor Joseph Dudley to the Council of Trade and Plantations, December 28, 1703," Calendar of State Papers, Vol. 21, No. 1398, 1422.

<sup>79</sup> "Minutes of New Hampshire Council in Assembly, December 23, 1703," Calendar of State Papers, Vol 21, No. 1409.

On February 9, 1704, Winthrop Hilton of New Hampshire led a force of provincial soldiers on snowshoes to Pequawket. Winthrop arrived at the village on the 16th and found it had been deserted for about six weeks, then brought his forces home again.<sup>80</sup> From the standpoint of enemy killed and crops destroyed the raid accomplished very little, but the psychological impact was tremendous. Hilton ended his journal of the march by concluding that "the winter time is the onely time ever to march against the Indian Enemy -- both for their discovery and the health and least danger of our People."<sup>81</sup> Dudley was so pleased with the result he sent a copy of Hilton's journal to the Board of Trade, adding in a postscript that "this march was made upon the snow a yard Deep, every man in snow shoes with twenty dayes provisions upon small hand [sleds] carrying each four Mens provisions and of three hundred men in the Expedition no man returned sick."<sup>82</sup>

Acts were now passed in both New Hampshire and Massachusetts ordering frontier communities to provide snowshoes for the use of the provincial soldiers posted there. "This season," observed Samuel Penhallow, "which before was

---

<sup>80</sup> Baxter, ed., Doc. Hist. Me., Vol. IX, 140-43. Hilton described the Indian town as circular with about 100 wigwams and store houses surrounded by a palisade.

<sup>81</sup> Baxter, ed., Doc. Hist. Me., Vol. IX, 142.

<sup>82</sup> "Governor Joseph Dudley to the Council of Trade and Plantations, March 3, 1704," Calendar of State Papers, Vol. 22, No. 159; Baxter, ed., Doc. Hist. Me., Vol. IX, 142.

dreaded as most hazardous, was now the time of greatest safety, and of less difficulty in travelling."<sup>83</sup> There is evidence which indicates the Eastern Indians had long feared the New Englanders might adopt this strategy. The party which devastated York in January, 1692 had been out scouting the woods for soldiers, "haveing been (as they say) advised by some of Sandy beach Captives that the Bostoners were provideing Many Snow Shoes and Designed a Considerable army out this winter to Disrest them at Some of their head quarters which has made them Very uneasy this winter."<sup>84</sup>

Now Winthrop Hilton had proved it could be done. Dudley wrote in April, 1704, that he had "given this Country as well as the Indians conviction that we can beare the frost and travell with our Victuals as long as they."<sup>85</sup> Winter raids became common, with Hilton out almost every winter until his death in 1710.<sup>86</sup> His most successful raid occurred in January, 1707, when soldiers under his command

---

<sup>83</sup> Penhallow, The History of the Wars of New England, 11.

<sup>84</sup> Baxter, ed., Doc. Hist. Me., Vol. X, 326.

<sup>85</sup> Baxter, ed., Doc. Hist. Me., Vol. IX, 180; "Governor Joseph Dudley to the Council of Trade and Plantations, April 20, 1704," Calendar of State Papers, Vol. 22, 260.

<sup>86</sup> In addition to his first in 1704, Hilton conducted major winter raids in 1705, 1707, and 1708. His death was tinged with some irony, however, as he was one of the "Gentlemen concerned in Providing Masts" who felt the frontier was so secure from enemy incursions (see above). Hilton died when his masting party was ambushed in July, 1710. See Belknap, The History of New Hampshire, 259.

surprised and killed over twenty Indians near Black Point, Maine.<sup>87</sup>

Although winter raids would continue throughout the rest of the early French wars, care had to be taken that early thaws did not ruin the design. Winthrop Hilton's original plan for his 1707 raid had to be curtailed when the "mildness of the winter prevented his going so far as expected."<sup>88</sup> Johnson Harmon, an officer with considerable raiding experience, returned exasperated from a scout which had been ordered for late February, 1723. Harmon led 120 men with snowshoes and moccasins up the Saco river, but found the ice in the rivers already broken up, forcing him to terminate the raid early. "It's a great grief to the perticular officers and no less to my Selfe," wrote Harmon, "that wee were Obliged to march into the woods in such a season when we had not a rational prospect of doing our Countrey service."<sup>89</sup>

A third important innovation commencing simultaneously with the winter marches was the encouragement of scalp hunters. Bounties for Indian scalps had been offered in

---

<sup>87</sup> Chandler E. Potter, The Military History of New Hampshire from its Founding until the Present Time (Report of the Adjutant-General of the State of New Hampshire for the Year ending June 1, 1866, Concord, NH, 1866), 23; "Journal of the Rev. John Pike," Massachusetts Historical Society Proceedings, 1875-76, Vol. XIV, 145; Penhallow, The History of the Wars of New England, 40-1. Now Scarboro, Maine.

<sup>88</sup> Penhallow, The History of the Wars of New England, 40.

<sup>89</sup> Trask, Letters of Colonel Thomas Westbrook, 11-12.

previous wars, but the governments of Massachusetts and New Hampshire now offered a larger reward for those who "maintain themselves free from the Province charge."<sup>90</sup> The initial rate was £40 per scalp, £8 pounds higher than volunteer provincial soldiers in "Her Majesty's Pay", and the scale would increase as the wars progressed.<sup>91</sup> Both Dudley and the parsimonious provincial assemblies seized on the concept of soldiers who would only be paid if successful, but Dudley was not without reservations. Essentially they would be freebooters recognizing little government control. As Dudley observed to Lt-Governor John Usher of New Hampshire in late November, 1703, "I am fearful the volunteers when they please will expect to disband and break in upon the right of the Government how to use them when we please. Here has been a great noise of volunteers in these parts, but are not the least benefit, and the souldiers must know wee can march them when we please without the word volunteers writt upon them."<sup>92</sup> But two weeks later he urged

---

<sup>90</sup> "Minutes of Massachusetts Council, December 2, 1703," Calendar of State Papers, Vol. 21, No. 1344.

<sup>91</sup> See Chapter Seven.

<sup>92</sup> "Governor Joseph Dudley to Lt-Governor John Usher, November, 28 1703," Calendar of State Papers, Vol. 21, No. 1425 f. The term "volunteer" can be confusing here. The new bounty hunters were referred to as volunteers, but there were also volunteer soldiers (as opposed to pressed soldiers and hired soldiers). Dudley was concerned that the volunteer soldiers would imitate the bounty hunters, who went out when they pleased, whereas soldiers, who had a guaranteed income from the government, could be ordered to march anywhere and at any time. To eliminate confusion in the present

Usher to "encourage the bussness of Volunteers."<sup>93</sup> The concept of scalp hunting would prove popular and increase the number of soldiers in the woods. The Reverend Thomas Smith of Falmouth recorded in his journal in 1745 that the "People seem wonderfully spirited to go out after the Indians. Four companies in this town and many more in other towns are fitting for it; the government offer four hundred pounds for the scalp of a man to those who go out at their own expense, and three hundred and ten pounds to those who have provision from the province."<sup>94</sup>

Eventually the government exerted some control on scalp hunters by regularizing their position. Companies of "snowshoe men" were raised in frontier communities commanded by officers with provincial commissions.<sup>95</sup> Unlike scouts taken from provincial forces posted on the frontier, snowshoe companies received wages only when they were actually on a raid, but were paid for scalps as volunteers. Thus the gov-

---

work, the new kind of volunteer will be always referred to as scalp hunters.

<sup>93</sup> "Governor Joseph Dudley to Lt-Governor John Usher, November, 28 1703," Calendar of State Papers, Vol. 21, No. 1425 h.

<sup>94</sup> Journals of the Rev. Thomas Smith and the Rev. Samuel Deane (Portland, ME, 1849), 121.

<sup>95</sup> The commission in snowshoe companies was a provincial rank, and was considered separate from the local militia rank, even though the men in the company belonged to both. For example, Seth Pomeroy received two commissions from the government, one as an officer in the militia, and one as officer of the local snowshoe company. The first was political, the second military. See Louis E. de Forest, ed., The Journal and Papers of Seth Pomeroy (New Haven, CN, 1926), 10-11.

ernment subordinated the scalp hunters through the commissions and wages. Many of the more famous and successful scout commanders operated under this system. For example, Johnson Harmon, who commanded the snowshoe men from York, Maine, and John Lovewell operated under this arrangement.

The use of offensive scouts reached its ultimate expression during Dummer's War. The Eastern Indian tribes had never really been satisfied with the peace arrangements that ended Queen Anne's War, and this discontentment was kept alive by French ambassadors in their midst, especially traders like St. Castine and Jesuit Priests like Sebastian Rasle at Norridgewock.<sup>96</sup> At the first sign of trouble the Bay government sent 200 men under Shadrach Walton to the Maine frontier. Walton's mission was essentially to "show the colors" through active scouting and thus discourage the Indians from further trouble.<sup>97</sup> Tensions gradually increased, however, over the next two years with the Indians venting most of their frustration against Fort St. George and the English increasing the number of both defensive and offensive scouts. In July, 1722 the Indians conducted a

---

<sup>96</sup> Baron St. Casten, and his son after him, maintained a trading post on the Penobscot River. Sebastian Rasle came to the New World with Frontenac in 1689 and took over the mission at Norridgewock almost immediately. A raiding party under Jeremiah Moulton found incriminating letters at Norridgewock proving that Rasle, with the blessing of the French government, was purposely agitating the Indians against the English. John Fiske, New France and New England (Boston, 1902), 235-43; Penhallow, The History of the Wars of New England, 99.

<sup>97</sup> Penhallow, The History of the Wars of New England, 84.

half-hearted siege against St. George while a provincial scout under Johnson Harmon and Samuel Moody killed eighteen Indians near Pejepscot.<sup>98</sup> Governor Samuel Shute acknowledged the obvious and declared war on the Eastern Indians.

But there was a major difference in this conflict. Although the French government encouraged the animosity between the Eastern Indians and the English, there could be no direct involvement as Great Britain and France were not at war, thus depriving the Indians of French officers for their larger raiding parties, logistical support, and sanctuary in Canada. The results would be disastrous for French policy and for the Eastern tribes.

The most successful raid conducted against the Eastern Indians in any of the wars occurred in August, 1724 when a force of provincial soldiers destroyed the village of Norridgewock and the principal promoter of French policies on the eastern frontier, the Jesuit Sebastian Rasle. The raiding party, numbering 205 white men and three Mohawk Indians, including the old scout Christian, and commanded by Johnson Harmon and Jeremiah Moulton left Fort Richmond on August 8 in seventeen whaleboats. Arriving at Teconnet on the 9th, they left the whaleboats under the protection of an officer and forty men and proceeded on foot. As they

---

<sup>98</sup> Penhallow, The History of the Wars of New England, 86-7. Penhallow reported they was some questions raised about the number of Indians killed as only fifteen scalps were taken.



approached the village Harmon took sixty men to destroy the corn fields while Moulton, after ordering ten men to guard the packs, attacked the village with the remainder of the force. After a brief fire fight they charged through the village driving the Indians across the river.<sup>99</sup> The raiding party returned to Fort Richmond on the 16th and Johnson Harmon was in Boston to make his report on the 22nd.<sup>100</sup>

The provincial forces suffered no casualties. They returned with twenty-six scalps, and estimated that fifty to eighty more Indians died in the river.<sup>101</sup> Among the slain were at least seven principal chiefs of the Norridgewocks and Sebastian Rasle. Samuel Penhallow called the raid on Norridgewock "the greatest Victory we have obtained in the three or four last Wars; and it may be as noble an Exploit (all things considered) as ever happened in the time of King Philip."<sup>102</sup> Besides the loss in lives and Indian

---

<sup>99</sup> As they marched away the following day Christian slipped back and set the village on fire. For more on the specifics of the fight, see Chapter Ten.

<sup>100</sup> "Journal of Johnson Harmon" in Banks, History of York, 326-29; Fannie Eckstorm, "The Attack on Norridgewock: 1724," New England Quarterly, (1934), 541-78; Thomas Hutchinson, The History of the Colony and Province of Massachusetts Bay (London, 1768; reprint Cambridge, MA, 1936), 235-7.

<sup>101</sup> Eckstorm, "The Attack on Norridgewock: 1724," NEQ (1934), 553-5. Estimates on enemy killed are always subject to a great deal of imagination and guess work, but Norridgewock represents the greatest number of Indians slain in one action (including both sexes and all ages of course) since the beginning of the French wars

<sup>102</sup> Penhallow, The History of the Wars of New England, 106.

leadership, the greatest blow probably was the elimination of the influence of Rasle. The village of Norridgewock did not disappear, but after the blow struck that August, they never were the threat they had been in the past.<sup>103</sup>

A second stroke against the Eastern Indians, this time the Pequawkets on the upper Saco river, involved the rise and fall of the King of the Scalp Hunters - John Lovewell. With a bounty of £100 for soldiers not in the government's pay, scalp hunting had become popular among the more adventurous on the frontier. Raising companies mainly from communities along the Merrimack river, Lovewell led three raids into Winnepesaukee-Ossipee-Pequawket region. In December, 1724 his first raid netted him one scalp and a captive boy, but in February, 1725 he and his men took ten scalps and returned in triumph to Dover, New Hampshire waving the bloody trophies. On April 16 he left Dunstable with a force of 47 men, three of whom turned back and another became so sick that Lovewell was forced to build a simple fort at Ossipee Lake where he left the sick man, the doctor and eight others. Lovewell then pushed on to Pequawket where his company was ambushed and fought an all day battle with seventy to eighty Indians in which Lovewell and fourteen others died and several others were wounded. The Indians

---

<sup>103</sup> The nineteenth century historian, John Fiske, wrote that "The destruction of that mission was a serious blow to the French hold upon the Maine frontier, and they never succeeded in making good the loss." New France and New England, 244.

broke off the action late in the afternoon and the surviving Englishmen made their way home.<sup>104</sup>

Apparently Lovewell's earlier successes generated an over-confidence which resulted in an unaccountable neglect of elementary precautions. Lovewell did not post a guard over the knapsacks when he and his men went to investigate the report of a gun. The Pequawkets found the packs and laid an ambush. Ironically, Lovewell had left such a guard over the knapsacks when he killed the ten Indians in February,<sup>105</sup> but the omission of this elementary precaution on his later raid probably cost him his life.

Like that other over-confident Indian fighter, George Armstrong Custer, John Lovewell in death became a greater hero than he had been in life. Eulogies and songs were composed in his honor and for the men who accompanied him.<sup>106</sup> The war itself was often referred to as Lovewell's War due to the fame of this slain scalp hunter. The impact on the Pequawkets was also profound. No accurate account of their casualties is known, but they did lose at least one

---

<sup>104</sup> Penhallow, The History of the Wars of New England, 112-7; Hutchinson, History of Massachusetts Bay, 239; George Hill Evans, Pigwacket (Somerville, MA, 1939), 62-66. See Chapter Ten for more details on the fight.

<sup>105</sup> Baxter, ed., Doc. Hist. Me., Vol. XXIII, 151. "16th came upon tracks of Indians, left packs with 16 men and pursued" - Lovewell's Journal of his February scout.

<sup>106</sup> In particular see Thomas Symmes, Historical Memoirs of the Battle at Pigwacket, or Lovewell Lament'd (Boston, 1725).

principal chief and many braves.<sup>107</sup> Historian Charles Clark believed the defeat of the Pequawkets opened the interior of New Hampshire, and the bloody results of Lovewell's fight contributed a great deal to this.<sup>108</sup> Like the Norridge-wocks, the Pequawkets did not disappear, but their military significance diminished greatly after Dummer's War.

With the power of the Eastern Indian tribes weakened, there was less emphasis on major raids during King George's War, however, the use of defensive patrols and small probing offensive scouts continued to be quite extensive. So extensive, in fact, that the Committee on Scouts of the New Hampshire Assembly reported "that from the 23rd of May 1744 to the 24th of August following we find Grants for men to be kept in his Majesty's service on the frontiers and at the fort [William and Mary] to the amount of 11,270 days."<sup>109</sup> John Goffe and Eleazer Melvin were only two of many men who led the small probing, offensive raids into enemy terri-

---

<sup>107</sup> Penhallow quoted a report that out of seventy Indians involved in the fight, forty were killed outright and eleven mortally wounded. This is obviously overly optimistic, but there is no question the Indians suffered more casualties than they were used to, as well as put a severe strain on their powder and lead supplies. They broke off the fight and did not return to scalp the dead. Three Indian bodies were found by soldiers sent to collect Lovewell's body, including the chief, Paugus. See Penhallow, The History of the Wars of New England, 113, 116.

<sup>108</sup> Charles E. Clark, The Eastern Frontier: The Settlement of Northern New England, 1610-1763 (New York, 1970), 97; "After this fight," wrote Jeremy Belknap, "the Indians moved away from Pequawket until the peace." See Belknap, The History of New Hampshire, 210.

<sup>109</sup> Hammond, ed., NHSP, Vol XVIII, 223.

tory.<sup>110</sup> Goffe was very active scouting on the New Hampshire frontier. In January, 1746 he led twenty men on snowshoes, in May he was out again with fifty, and in June with thirteen.<sup>111</sup> Melvin, while stationed at Fort Dummer, led a particularly harrowing raid to the shores of Lake Champlain in 1747.<sup>112</sup>

The use of larger raiding forces was also inhibited by other military considerations. With the French once again involved in the conflict, the governments of Massachusetts and New Hampshire were all the more determined to conquer New France. Thus the men who would have been used on major raids volunteered for expeditions. They went to Louisbourg in 1745, and the following summer joined another force raised for an intended assault on Canada which never materialized. In October, 1746 news arrived of a French fleet sent to attack New England and more soldiers were enlisted to defend the coast. When the French fleet met disaster, the provincial governments kept this army together for one year in anticipation of an assault on Montreal. Eleazer

---

<sup>110</sup> Both men had been part of Lovewell's company during his ill-fated raid to Pequawket. Goffe had been one of the eight men left at the stockade with the sick man, who apparently was a friend of his, while both Melvin and his brother, David, participated in the battle itself, surviving without a wound. See William Howard Brown, Colonel John Goffe: Eighteenth Century New Hampshire (Manchester, NH, 1950), 38-40.

<sup>111</sup> Brown, John Goffe, 48.

<sup>112</sup> "Journal of Capt Eleazer Melvin," New Hampshire Historical Society. For more details on this raid, see Chapter Ten.

Melvin, who served as a lieutenant at Louisbourg, enlisted in the latter force and spent most of 1747 drilling, marching, and waiting in vain to attack Canada.<sup>113</sup> Although he had been active in scouting during 1746, John Goffe also enlisted in the provincial forces raised that October, and as part of Atkinson's regiment spent the next year cooped up in the small fort at Lake Winnepesaukee.<sup>114</sup>

The scouting system as part of the military strategy of New England was not without its critics. Both contemporaries and subsequent historians have questioned the value of the patrols and raids, and the competency of the soldiers participating in them. The nineteenth century historian Samuel Adams Drake in particular diminished the efforts of the provincial soldiers. "It being worse than useless to play at hide and seek with these vigilant foemen," wrote Drake, "who first showed themselves in one place and then in another, far distant, the authorities persevered in the plan of hunting them down in their own villages. Usually it was next to impossible for white men to approach them undiscovered, and after long and frightful marches a few deserted wigwams would be all that the disappointed rangers could find."<sup>115</sup> Time and again the New England governments sent

---

<sup>113</sup> Melvin Journal, NHHS.

<sup>114</sup> Brown, John Goffe, 48. See Chapter Three for more information on Fort Atkinson.

<sup>115</sup> Drake, The Border Wars of New England, 165.

their soldiers into Indian territory only to find no trace of the enemy, or even worse, to have that enemy sweep in behind to kill and burn at will. Jeremiah Swain's "march [in 1689] ... disclosed the weakness of the whole system of defense; for Swain had no sooner uncovered the towns in his rear, after taking with him every available man that could be spared, than the Indians swooped down upon Durham."<sup>116</sup>

Drake saved his most acerbic comments for his evaluation of Benjamin Church. In Drake's opinion, "his ill-fortune dogged him like his shadow." His 1696 raid along the coast of Maine ended "like the others that had gone before it, in disappointment and disgrace,"<sup>117</sup> and in 1704 he failed to take Fort Royal when the opportunity presented itself. In Drake's view Church, "with a force at hand fully competent to the task before it," failed to take advantage of his strength and contented himself "with a mere idle demonstration." "This ridiculous affair," wrote Drake, "...

---

<sup>116</sup> Drake, The Border Wars of New England, 37. Some contemporary soldiers shared Drake's concerns. During King Philip's War, Thomas Savage wrote to the Bay government with his assessment of the patrol system. "Gentlemen, I humbly propose to your honours, whether this way of following the enemy up and down in the woods will best reach your end at this season of the year, in which they have no certain fixed station, but can take advantages against us and avoid us when they please, as our experience in this march hath shewed, by their burning their wigwams and marching away before us, they discovering us when we cannot see them." - "Thomas Savage to John Leveret and Massachusetts Court, 16 March, 1675," Massachusetts Historical Society Collections, 3rd Series, Vol. 1, 68-70.

<sup>117</sup> Drake, The Border Wars of New England, 113-4.

looked in the main as a failure, and if adaption of means to ends be looked to, it was one."<sup>118</sup>

Drake's criticisms only echo some contemporary observers. Benjamin Church's raids, especially his last one, produced mixed reactions. "Notwithstanding the Fatigue that this worthy Gentleman had undergone," wrote Samuel Penhallow, "and the Dangers he had run; the Spoil he had done, and the Victories he Wan, yet he could not escape the Censures of many. Some indeed extoled his Valour and Conduct even to an Hyperbole, while others endeavoured to lessen it With as much Disgrace and Infamy. Some thought he did too much, others too little."<sup>119</sup>

Drake and the other critics of provincial scouting efforts seem to gauge success by one criteria - body count. Raids were only successful if they resulted in a large number of enemy killed, thus the expense of increased scouts during Queen Anne's War led to that often quoted observation "that every Indian we had killed or taken, cost the Country at least a Thousand Pounds."<sup>120</sup> But attrition, not scalps, proved to be the real purpose of the raids and patrols. "We may ... destroy their corn and houses," wrote Governor Dudley to the Board of Trade, "but no likelihood of seeing them, who will have their scouts out, and march off as we

---

<sup>118</sup> Drake, The Border Wars of New England, 202.

<sup>119</sup> Penhallow, The History of the Wars of New England, 19.

<sup>120</sup> Penhallow, The History of the Wars of New England, 40;  
Drake, The Border Wars of New England, 220.



approach them ... however the experience of the best men that have at any time been here can advise to no better method then by constant marches, especially in the winter to dislodge and starve them."<sup>121</sup> Samuel Penhallow observed that "although the Number [of Indians] that we destroyed ... seems inconsiderable to what they did of ours, yet by Cold, Hunger, and Sickness, at least a third of them was wasted since the War begun ... which made the Old Men weary of the War, and to covet Peace."<sup>122</sup>

Proffering a familiar theme, Canadian historian W. J. Eccles believed New France was conquered by the British army only after it was proven that the English colonists had been bested in *petite guerre* by the French and their Indian allies. "The English colonials [could not] wage this type of warfare. For success it required men who could live in the wilderness and strike swiftly like Indians; who could march great distances on snowshoes in the bitter, morale-destroying cold, carrying their meagre supplies; and who could go into the attack at the end of a journey that in itself was a severe test of a man's endurance."<sup>123</sup> But under the leadership of men such as Benjamin Church, Winthrop Hilton, Johnson Harmon, John Lovewell, and John

---

<sup>121</sup> "Governor Joseph Dudley to Council of Trade and Plantations, Spetember 15, 1703," Calendar of State Papers, Vol. 21, No. 1094.

<sup>122</sup> Penhallow, The History of the Wars of New England, 60-1.

<sup>123</sup> W. J. Eccles, Canada under Louis XIV, 1663-1701 (London, 1964), 173.

Goffe the provincial soldiers were able to traverse great distances even in winter, carry their meager supplies and attack the enemy at the end of their journey. As Jeremy Belknap described them at the end of Dummer's War, the provincial soldiers of northern New England were "completely trained for active service; every man of forty years of age having seen more than twenty years of war. They had been used to handle their arms from the age of childhood, and most of them, by long practice, had become excellent marksmen, and good hunters. They were well acquainted with the lurking places of the enemy; and possessed a degree of hardiness and intrepidity, which can be acquired only by the habitude of those scenes of danger and fatigue, to which they were daily exposed."<sup>124</sup>

While the blows struck against the Norridgewock and Pequawket tribes during Dummer's War were the most conspicuous achievements of the provincial scouting parties, it is unknown how many lives were also saved by diligent patrols and raiding parties. The tactical adjustment made by the French and Indians during Queen Anne's War from the larger raids to smaller parties was probably forced by the growing numbers of provincial soldiers in the woods, however this development was a mixed blessing. While preventing the wholesale destruction of communities, the smaller parties

---

<sup>124</sup> Belknap, The History of New Hampshire, 217-8. Belknap wrote with the unmistakable prejudice of pride; but as it concerns the most active of the scouting soldiers, his statement is accurate in a general sense.

were less easy to detect, and thus, in the words of Samuel Penhallow, "did much more mischief then in larger."<sup>125</sup> Small groups of ten to twenty could slip in undetected to kill unwary inhabitants, and this sort of incursion could not be totally stopped by the English anymore than the French could stop the Iroquois.<sup>126</sup> The provincial governments of New England knew the final solution to this problem was the reduction of Canada itself.

---

<sup>125</sup> Penhallow, The History of the Wars of New England, 9.

<sup>126</sup> Even W. J. Eccles had to admit that "Iroquois war parties infiltrated the settlements [of New France], struck swiftly, then vanished like wolves into the forest leaving behind smoking ruins where once a home had stood and, in the ashes, the mutilated, scalped bodies of the habitant and his family. Try as they might, the Canadians and regular troops were unable to forfend these attacks." See Eccles, Canada under Louis XIV, 171.

## CHAPTER FIVE

### EXPEDITIONS

To critics of the New England provincial soldier, nothing illustrates the chasm between their ineffectiveness and the superiority of the *coureur de bois* more than the inability of the English to emulate their enemy and assault French communities. "They had no body of men," wrote W. J. Eccles, "capable of traveling through hundreds of miles of trackless wilderness ... to attack New France."<sup>1</sup> Jeremy

---

<sup>1</sup> W. J. Eccles, The Canadian Frontier, 1534-1760 (Albuquerque, NM, 1974), 139. The *coureur de bois* were men involved in the fur trade. Acting as agents and middlemen between the Indian tribes and the French government, they acquired an intimate knowledge of Indian customs and language, as well as the ability to lead Indian raiding parties against English targets. According to the traditional interpretation, the economy of New England, based on agriculture, naval stores, fishing and trade, did not produce an equal to the *coureur de bois*. However, most of the true Canadian fur trappers operated with the western tribes where distance from settled areas precluded direct trade, and the French government, with the exception of Frontenac, did not rely heavily on the western tribes for warriors until the Seven Years War. The raiding parties against New England in the early wars were led by officers from the *Troupe de la Marine* companies stationed in New France, and the companies were drawn principally from the Eastern tribes, St. Francis and other Christian Indians, Canadian militia from Montreal and Trois Riviere, and a handful of eastern-based *coureur de bois*. That they were very efficient at *petite guerre* there is no denying, and I am not trying to belittle their abil-

Belknap observed that "the [French] kept out small parties continually engaged in killing, scalping and taking prisoners ... on the other hand, the English attended only to the defence of the frontiers; and that in such a manner, as to leave them for the most part insecure. No parties were sent to harass the settlements of the French."<sup>2</sup> Some contemporaries agreed with Belknap's observation and lamented that the New England governments concentrated too much on defense, and "being onely on defencive; we waste away."<sup>3</sup> But as far as can be determined, the provincial governments never considered raids against French villages as an efficacious form of offensive strategy. The final solution to the French and the Indian problem was the reduction of Canada itself, and thus it is unreasonable to assume the provincial soldiers of New England were incapable of emulating their Canadian counterparts when they never attempted, or even contemplated, such an action. From the beginning of the French wars the people of New England agreed with the sentiments of Governor Joseph Dudley, that

---

ity or accomplishments. My point is that just because New England did not concentrate on the fur trade and develop an equivalent to the *coureur de bois*, does not mean provincial soldiers were incapable of conducting such raids. Whether they were capable or not will never be known because they never attempted it.

<sup>2</sup> Jeremy Belknap, The History of New Hampshire (Reprint of 1831 edition, New York, 1970) Vol 1, 295.

<sup>3</sup> "Lt-Governor John Usher to Council of Trade and Plantations, June 28, 1708," Calendar of State Papers, Colonial Series, America and West India, 1706-1708 (Reprint of 1916 edition, Vaduz, 1964), Vol. 23, No. 1592.

"all this unspeakable Trouble and Cost would be saved by rooting out the French at Quebeck and Mont Real."<sup>4</sup>

The story of the New England expeditions against New France has been frequently told.<sup>5</sup> To provincial strate-

---

<sup>4</sup> "Governor Joseph Dudley to the Council of Trade and Plantations, March, 1709," in James Phinney Baxter, ed., Documentary History of the State of Maine, (Portland, ME, 1907), Collections of the Maine Historical Society, 2nd Series, Vol. IX, 264. Perhaps no one expressed the New England position better than Cotton Mather, when he wrote "[A member of parliament once said] that his own House had been much annoyed by Rooks building in a Tree, near unto it, and that he had used many ineffectual ways to disturb, and disroot these mischievous Rooks, until at last he found out an infallible way to be delivered from the Rooks, and that was to cut down the Tree that Lodged 'em. The Distresses into which New-England was now fallen, made this very comparison to be thought of. The Indian Rooks grievously infested the Country; and while the Country was only on the Defensive Part, their men were Thinned, their Towns were Broken, and their Treasures consumed, without any Hope of seeing an End of these Troublesome Tragedies. The French Colonies to the Northward were the Tree in which those Rooks had their Nests; and the French having in person first fallen upon the English of New-England, it was thought that the New-Englanders might very justly take this Occasion to Reduce those French Colonies under the English Government, and so at once take away from all the Rooks for ever, all that gave 'em any Advantage to Infest us." See Cotton Mather, Decennium Luctuosum (1699, reprinted in Charles H. Lincoln, ed., Narratives of the Indian Wars, 1675-1699, New York, 1913), 214.

<sup>5</sup> The expeditions under consideration include the attacks led by Sir William Phips in 1690 against Port Royal and Quebec, the former successful, the latter a disaster; the double assault on Port Royal in 1707, and the more fruitful siege in 1710; the Walker expedition of 1711 against Quebec; Louisbourg in 1745; and the planned (and prepared for) expeditions against Quebec in 1709 and 1746, and Montreal in 1747 which never materialized. Provincial soldiers also participated in Admiral Vernon's expedition against Cartagena, but unlike the attacks on Canada, colonial leaders were not involved in the conception and planning of this attack, and their soldiers only served as warm bodies in uniform to flesh out an essentially English operation.

gists, the reduction of Canada meant the capture of Quebec. Serving New France both as capitol and principal port, its capture would not only be a crushing symbolic and political blow, but would cut the colony off from French supplies and military support. While the first major attempt to capture the city in 1690 failed, the strategy employed, the well-known simultaneous two-pronged assault on Montreal and Quebec, was sound and ultimately would be successful. But the failure of the 1690 expedition also proved that the New England governments did not have the logistical or naval capabilities, nor even the financial base, to reduce Canada on their own.<sup>6</sup> The final solution to the French problem in the New World would have to be settled in partnership with the London government.

Beyond Quebec itself, the French strongholds in the maritimes seemed at first to be a reasonable target for provincial forces. From their ports in Nova Scotia, and later Cape Breton, the French dispatched privateers to attack New England commerce and fisheries, and supplied

---

<sup>6</sup> Even before Phips' expedition, some New Englanders recognized they could not provide all that was necessary for a major military campaign, but that the reduction of New France "might be accomplished with some little help from England." See "Nicholas Bayard to Francis Nicholson, August 5, 1689," Calendar of State Papers, Colonial Series, America and West Indies, 1689-1692 (Reprint of 1903 edition, Vaduz, 1964), Vol. 13, No. 320. In March, 1690, Elisha Hutchison wrote that "Our great want is arms and ammunition, else we might attack Canada ... If the King could provide us with two frigates, arms and ammunition, it might be easily accomplished." See "Elisha Hutchison to Elisha Cook, March 31, 1690," Calendar of State Papers, Vol. 13, No. 802.

their Eastern Indian allies with military stores. The New England governments understood that the capture of Nova Scotia and Cape Breton would not reduce Canada, but the elimination of these privateers and the weakening of the French alliance with the Eastern Indians were important secondary objectives. Because of their close proximity to New England and their remoteness from the center of French power in Canada, the provincial governments felt confident the maritime targets were well within the capabilities of their military forces, and certainly the victory at Port Royal in the Spring of 1690 seemed to confirm this judgement. However, that victory only delayed the inevitable conclusion underlined by the subsequent double failure to retake Port Royal in 1707 - the colonies could not undertake expeditions on their own. After 1707 all colonial attempts to assault Canada, including the maritime provinces, required the assistance of the British government.

Military expeditions in the eighteenth century consisted of many essential components. The successful expedition required: soldiers for the initial fighting and for a garrison after reduction of the objective; artillery to reduce fortifications; powder and shot; engineers to conduct the siege and gunners to lay the artillery; provisions to feed and clothe the army during and after the attack; transport for the soldiers and provisions; warships to aid in the siege and protect the transport fleet from counterattacks; and, finally, the money to pay for it all.



In 1690 the governments of northern New England twice attempted to provide all the components for major attacks on Canada and came up short both times resulting in unsatisfactory results in one instance and defeat and financial ruin on the other.<sup>7</sup> While, as an anonymous member of the Quebec expedition recorded, "the New Englanders are not discouraged by one repulse,"<sup>8</sup> they were discouraged by the cost and their own inadequacies. Thus a military partnership developed between the provincial governments and London in which the latter provided all the components for expeditions which were difficult or impossible for the colonies to contribute.

The principal New England contribution were provincial soldiers for the main assault or fighting force. "There are men Enough in New England," observed one member of the 1690 Quebec expedition, "that will offer themselves as Volunteirs."<sup>9</sup> Jeremy Belknap indicated that during King George's War "the prospect of an a expedition to Canada had induced many of the soldiers who were posted on the frontiers to enlist into the regiments, because they preferred active service to the dull routine of a

---

<sup>7</sup> The disaster at Quebec is well known, and although the early assault on Port Royal was successful, the provincial army lacked a key ingredient for ultimate success, namely, the troops to garrison the fort. See below.

<sup>8</sup> Anon, "Phips Expedition to Canada," Proceedings of the Massachusetts Historical Society, Vol XV, Second Series, 318.

<sup>9</sup> Anon. "Phips Expedition to Canada," Proceedings of the Mass. Hist. Soc., 318.

garrison."<sup>10</sup> Enlistment quotas established for each colony were always filled, although not without effort, especially when recent disappointments remained fresh in the public's memory. The ill-fated Port Royal expedition of 1707 created great difficulties for the Province of New Hampshire in raising troops for the intended assault on Canada in 1709.<sup>11</sup> And the tremendous disappointment accompanying that aborted affair caused problems for recruiting officers the following summer, as did the alleged mistreatment of the soldiers at Louisbourg following its surrender in 1745. In addition to previous disappointments, the normal strain of conducting a war hurt recruiting. Jeremy Belknap reported that New Hampshire managed to raise 100 men for the Walker expedition in 1711 despite the fact half of their available manpower was already serving on the frontier.<sup>12</sup>

As their second major contribution, the colonies provided provisions for both their own soldiers and any forces sent from England. A two to three month supply was considered a minimum initial allocation, and food which could be easily preserved was preferred.<sup>13</sup> Salted meat,

---

<sup>10</sup> Belknap, The History of New Hampshire, 291.

<sup>11</sup> Belknap, The History of New Hampshire, 177.

<sup>12</sup> Belknap, The History of New Hampshire, 180.

<sup>13</sup> For example, when New Hampshire raised 100 men for the Walker expedition the Assembly voted that 126 days worth of provisions for these soldiers be gathered as well. Massachusetts also raised three months provisions for the Port Royal expedition of 1710. See Belknap, The History of New Hampshire, 180; "Governor Joseph Dudley to Council of Trade and Plantations, Nov-

hard biscuits and grain were the staples of a military diet, although troops were fed fresh victuals while waiting for embarkation.<sup>14</sup> If the provisions were not available from public sources, the Assemblies instructed their commissary agents to purchase or impress food from private individuals. The Louisbourg expedition created a considerable strain on public supplies of foodstuffs due to the size of the force being raised. When New Hampshire found that no pork was available in Boston, the Council instructed that warrants be issued "for impressing such and so much pork as shall be necessary for the present emergency from those persons that have any to spare more than what is necessary for the use of their respective families."<sup>15</sup> During the second half of

---

ember 15, 1710," Calendar of State Papers, Colonial Series, America and West Indies, 1710-June, 1711 (Reprint of 1924 edition, Vaduz, 1964), Vol. 25, No. 491.

<sup>14</sup> "Thomas Savage to his brother in England, 1691," (Originally published in London, 1691), Collections of the Massachusetts Historical Society, 2nd Ser., Vol III, 257. Nevertheless, even preserved food was subject to spoiling if held too long. The New Hampshire House reported in July, 1747 that "Whereas the provisions and stores laid in for the Canada Expedition are in great danger of taking damage having been long laid in store and there being no prospect that they will be wanted for that expedition the present year, Voted that the committee for procuring stores &c for that expedition be empowered to make sale of said provisions & stores as soon as may be ... and to overhall such as they do not sell and if need be have them repacked or do what may be needful for their preservation." See Nathaniel Bouton, Documents and Records Relating to the Province of New Hampshire from 1738-1749 (Nashua, NH, 1871), New Hampshire State and Provincial Papers, Vol. V, 519.

<sup>15</sup> "Records of the Council, Feb. 22, 1745," NHSP, Vol. V, 101.

Queen Anne's War and throughout King George's War, annual preparations for major expeditions, whether realized or not, drained the colonies of foodstuffs. Because provincials soldiers spent the summer of 1709 drilling and eating while waiting in vain for British support, colonial leaders found provisions, especially pork and beef, scarce the following summer when raising the expedition for Port Royal.<sup>16</sup> In preparing for the Walker expedition in 1711, the New England governments discovered that after three years of providing for major military campaigns it was "impossible to provide pork and pease, etc. sufficient for the fleet and forces, [and] proposed there be two fish days in a week for the forces coming from Great Brittain," and they asked New York to supply the fish.<sup>17</sup>

In the end, the middle colonies offered to provide the bulk of the supplies for the expedition. However, the Governor of New York would not let the ships carrying the foodstuffs sail without an armed escort, so when the British arrived in Boston, they found no provisions waiting. The disaffected British Quartermaster General, Richard King, pressed the Bay government to provide food for his soldiers and sailors. Local communities around Boston began to send in fresh provisions, mostly on the hoof, but King discovered

---

<sup>16</sup> "Francis Nicholson and Samuel Vetch to Council of Trade and Plantations, September 16, 1710," Calendar of State Papers, Vol. 25, No. 396.

<sup>17</sup> "Minutes of a Council of War, June 21, 1711," Calendar of State Papers, Vol. 25, No. 893.

the amounts "not sufficient for a quarter of our troops. And all other things to be provided, were brought us with that sloath and indifference." A "diligent search was made for all the provisions in town that were proper to carry to sea," and King secured quantities of wheat, rye and Indian corn to make bread. The provision ships from New York arrived two weeks later.<sup>18</sup>

The withdrawal of these foodstuffs from the stores of New England communities created both hardships for the inhabitants and the opportunity for profiteering.<sup>19</sup> In The Urban Crucible, Gary Nash described the tension created by war shortages and the clash between the traditional duty of government to assure minimal subsistence at a just price and the new economic theory of supply and demand. In particular, Nash related the story of Andrew Belcher, one of

---

<sup>18</sup> "Colonel Richard King to Mr. Secretary St John, July 25, 1711," Calendar of State Papers, Colonial Series, America and West Indies, July, 1711-June, 1712 (Reprint of 1925 edition, Vaduz, 1964), Vol. 26, No. 46. When he found the colonial transport ships not prepared or provisioned, King vented his frustrations in his journal. "The reluctancy and ill nature that these people shewed to serve us and forward the Expedition upon all occasions before: did not near so fully demonstrate their preverse and wicked intentions as this great neglect: it being evident to anybody that has seen this country, that they could fitt out and man twice the number of vessells they were to furnish for this Expedition in much less time than they had to do it in." Like most British officers in the eighteenth century, King believed the needs of the King's troops came first, and had little compassion or understanding for colonials or their problems.

<sup>19</sup> Douglas Leach, Arms for Empire: A Military History of the British Colonies in North America, 1607-1763 (New York, 1973), 266.

Boston's largest grain merchants who was appointed Commissary General for the Bay government. Contracted to supply provisions for the 400 Royal marines coming to aid the 1710 Port Royal expedition, Belcher, as a grain merchant, bought up all available grain supplies and, when the price had risen accordingly, sold the grain to himself as Commissary General for a tidy profit. The frustrations of the general population over the shortage of bread and high prices exploded when Belcher attempted to export the surplus rather than reintroduce the grain into the local economy, an explosion that included mob attacks on Belcher's ships and warehouses.<sup>20</sup>

When the duration of expeditions became extended, or their commencement delayed, the depletion of the initial allocation of provisions increased logistical difficulties. In addition, as the soldiers' personal wardrobe wore out, clothing and shoes added to the problems of provincial commissary agents.<sup>21</sup> The length of the Louisbourg campaign

---

<sup>20</sup> Gary B. Nash, The Urban Crucible: The Northern Seaports and the Origins of the American Revolution (Abridged Edition, Cambridge, MA, 1986), 46-7.

<sup>21</sup> Uniforms were only issued to provincial soldiers on a few occasions, and only when the British supplied them. Provincial soldiers received uniforms for the Walker expedition in 1711 and for Cartagena in 1740. On one occasion, the aborted 1709 expedition, coats were provided by the provincial governments as an added incentive for enlistment, but they were not uniforms. Samuel Vetch simply ordered that the coats be red or blue, and by color coordinating the companies, gave the appearance of uniformity to inspire the men. Under normal conditions, provincial soldiers wore their own clothing when reporting for duty. See "Samuel Vetch to Earl of Sunderland, August 2, 12, 1709," Calendar of State

exacerbated the problem of supply as the forces raised at the end of February, 1745, began to exhaust their provisions by April, weeks before they made their landing at Gabarus Bay.<sup>22</sup> On April 10, William Pepperrell wrote to John Osbourne, Chairman of the Committee of War, that the army had no more than thirty days provisions, and that it would be a shame to "fail in our attempt, for want of the necessities of life with which our country is so richly supplied."<sup>23</sup>

After the fall of Louisbourg the shortage of provisions and clothing continued. The commissary agent for the New Hampshire regiment in particular earned the censure of the soldiers whom he served. A group of officers complained to the New Hampshire Assembly that there had been "a general cry of injustice and oppression against our Commissary throughout the regiment, during the greater part of the siege; and that, besides the great uneasiness occasioned by the soldiers being denied their just allowance, the discontent was increased and aggravated by an uncompassionate refusal of necessities to the sick." The officers desired a committee be established to investigate the

---

Papers, Colonial Series, America and West Indies, June, 1708-1709 (Reprint of 1922 edition, Vaduz, 1964), Vol. 24, No. 666; "James Blake to Mr. Secretray St John, October 1, 1711," Calendar of State Papers, Vol. 26, No. 115. For more on uniform issue see Chapter Seven.

<sup>22</sup> "Pepperrell to Shirley, 10 April, 1745," Collections of the Massachusetts Historical Society, 1st Ser., Vol. I (1794), 14-16.

<sup>23</sup> "Pepperrell Papers," Collections of the Massachusetts Historical Society, 6th Ser., Vol. X (1899), 124-5.

commissary, and were convinced "there was a just ground for the general discontent and uneasiness, [and] that his tender mercies were cruelty." Because of his "fraud, injustice and oppression," the New Hampshire soldiers "endured hazard and hardships with intrepidity, when almost naked and quite lousie, without flinching from shot or shell, and being on duty twenty-four hours at a time ... without one morsel of meat, or one drop of spirits ... (and nothing better to drink than ill tasted, purging water) during the greater part of the siege."<sup>24</sup>

Pepperrell informed Governor William Shirley in early August that the provincial forces on the whole were destitute of clothing and for all intents and purposes naked and barefoot. He wrote that the shoes which had been sent were too small and the shirts too short.<sup>25</sup> In replying to Pepperrell's complaints, John Osbourne indicated that the Committee of War was trying to supply the soldiers' needs, but procurement was difficult. The Bay government had impressed tailors to make more clothing and cordwainers to make shoes, and Osbourne reported that his committee was "daily picking up all that we can lay our hands on, yet do

---

<sup>24</sup> Chandler E. Potter, The Military History of New Hampshire from its Founding until the Present Time (Report of the Adjutant-General of the State of New Hampshire for the Year ending June 1, 1866, Concord, NH, 1866), 73-75.

<sup>25</sup> "Pepperrell Papers," Colls. Mass. Hist. Soc., 6th Ser., Vol. X, 348-9.



not expect to send full supply till some woolen goods arrive from England."<sup>26</sup>

Once the soldiers had been mustered and the provisions gathered, they had to be transported to the target, and that required the impressment or hire of provincial merchant and fishing vessels. Sir William Phips' Quebec fleet in 1690 consisted of thirty-two such craft, of all sizes and descriptions,<sup>27</sup> and the Port Royal expedition of 1710 numbered twenty.<sup>28</sup> Perhaps the greatest colonial fleet accompanied William Pepperrell to Louisbourg. It contained ninety odd transport vessels and about a dozen assorted small warships.<sup>29</sup> As provincial authorities closed their ports until expeditions actually sailed to prevent disclosure of their intentions to the French, owners willingly loaned their vessels to the governments so they would continue to earn money.<sup>30</sup> But like the consumption of

---

<sup>26</sup> "Pepperrell Papers," Colls. Mass. Hist. Soc., 6th Ser., Vol. X, 358, 365-6.

<sup>27</sup> Francis Parkman, Count Frontenac and New France under Louis XIV, (Boston, 1896), 245.

<sup>28</sup> "Governor Joseph Dudley to Council of Trade and Plantations, November 15, 1710," Calendar of State Papers, Vol. 25, No. 491.

<sup>29</sup> Fairfax Downey, Louisbourg: Key to a Continent (Englewood Cliffs, NJ, 1965), 63.

<sup>30</sup> "Thomas Cockrill to Council of Trade and Plantations, July 2, 1709," Calendar of State Papers, Vol. 24, No. 617; In March, 1690, Charles Redford of Salem complained to Sir Edmund Andros that "Our Savity [committee of safety] have laid an embargo on all vessels and are on some great exploit, some say Canada, some say Port Royal." See "Charles Redford to Sir Edmund

provisions, the lack of trade hurt the general economy, and a delay or extended operation only aggravated the situation. For example, even after the capture of Louisbourg, many vessels had to remain in government service to transport further shipments of supplies and replacements, and thus were unable to return to trade or fishing.<sup>31</sup>

As noted earlier, while supremely confident in the capability and enthusiasm of their people to support major expeditions, the New England governments knew they could not undertake the reduction of Canada totally on their own.<sup>32</sup> But convincing a British government, whose eyes were firmly fixed on European affairs, that it was in their best interest to assist the colonies in the capture of Canada proved to be difficult at best. The colonial lobby used none too gentle prodding to shift the gaze of Whitehall across the Atlantic and provide the necessary support by approaching the subject through the London government's Achilles' heel - the pocket book. Provincial agents and leaders emphasized that beyond the elimination of the cost of the war itself, the French colony would provide England

---

Andros, March 7, 1689," Calendar of State Papers, Vol. 13, No. 783.

<sup>31</sup> Julian Gwyn, "War and Economic Change: Louisbourg and the New England Economy in the 1740's," Revue de l'U d'Ottawa, 47, No. 1-2 (1977), 122. Gwyn indicated that "New England's trade with Great Britain, upon which so much of her American earnings depended, reached in 1745 the lowest point of the entire war. It is to the deflection of shipping to the Louisbourg expedition that this can be directly attributed."

<sup>32</sup> Leach, Arms for Empire, 139.

with an unlimited source of furs and fish, and, most importantly, masts, hemp, pitch and tar for the British navy.<sup>33</sup>

Even after convincing the British of the rewards for taking Canada, the provincial governments had to contend with the fearsome and complicated bureaucracy of an eighteenth century mercantile government -- a tangled maze best illustrated by the preparation for 1709 Quebec expedition. On July 29, 1708, Samuel Vetch, that ambitious and somewhat unscrupulous Boston merchant,<sup>34</sup> presented a lengthy and detailed proposal for the reduction of Canada before the Board of Trade. Entitled "Canada Surveyed", Vetch's proposal enumerated the advantages to be gained, including the end of a considerable financial drain caused by the war (Vetch said a half of one year's loss would pay for the reduction), and the wealth of furs, fish, grain and naval stores to be found. To realize this tremendous financial opportunity the British government need only provide two battalions of regulars and six men of war. New England would provide a thousand soldiers with transport while the middle colonies launched a force of 1,500 against Montreal

---

<sup>33</sup> "Canada Survey'd, July 27, 1708," and "Colonel John Higginson of New England, June 30, 1709," Calendar of State Papers, Vol. 24, Nos. 60, 609.

<sup>34</sup> Leach, Arms for Empire, 139. Vetch had earlier been accused of trading with the enemy when sent to Nova Scotia to negotiate for the release of captives. For more on Vetch see G. M. Waller, Samuel Vetch, Colonial Enterpriser (Chapel Hill, NC, 1960).

in the classic two-pronged assault.<sup>35</sup> The Board of Trade sent the proposal to Secretary of State Henry Boyle on August 4, and a week later Boyle wrote back urging the plan be given every consideration.<sup>36</sup>

Throughout the remainder of the summer and that fall the plan underwent study and analysis. In early November the Board of Trade asked Vetch to clarify certain points in his plan and he obliged on the 17th. Vetch stated that the New England colonies would have 1,000 men with the best officers, three months provisions, transports and pilots ready by the end of April. London would dispatch a frigate to escort these transports to the rendezvous with the British warships off the New Hampshire coast. Vetch also suggested that the government send muskets, flints and ammunition for the provincials, and that the problem of command - land vs. sea, provincial vs. regular - be settled before sailing.<sup>37</sup> On November 29, Vetch provided further information on the condition of Canada, including population

---

<sup>35</sup> "Canada Survey'd, July 27, 1708," Calendar of State Papers, Vol. 24, No. 60.

<sup>36</sup> "Council of Trade and Plantations to Secretary of State Henry Boyle, August 4, 1708," and "Secretary Boyle to Council of Trade and Plantations, August 11, 1708," Calendar of State Papers, Vol. 24, Nos. 71, 85.

<sup>37</sup> "Explanatory Supplement to Vetch's Canada Proposal, November 17, 1708," Calendar of State Papers, Vol. 24, No. 196.

figures, Indian allies and the number and location of French forts.<sup>38</sup>

With all their questions answered, the Board of Trade finally placed Vetch's proposal before the Queen on December 1, emphasizing that the West Indies depended on trade from New England, this trade was disrupted by the war, and so elimination of the French colony would end the disruption.<sup>39</sup> Three months later, on March 1, Her Majesty's instructions were issued to Samuel Vetch to prepare for his expedition to Canada. Vetch sailed for the colonies, arriving in Boston on April 28 where he immediately set out to assemble the provincial contribution.<sup>40</sup> On June 28 Vetch wrote to Secretary Boyle indicating that there appeared to be "nothing (human speaking) which can disappoint this noble design."<sup>41</sup>

Vetch was wrong, of course. The following day, June 29, the London government learned that the French and Spanish had captured the Bahamas the previous April. On

---

<sup>38</sup> "Samuel Vetch to Council of Trade and Plantations, November 29, 1708," Calendar of State Papers, Vol. 24, No. 217.

<sup>39</sup> "Council of Trade and Plantations to the Queen, December 1, 1708," Calendar of State Papers, Vol. 24, No. 221.

<sup>40</sup> "H. M. Instructions for Colonel Vetch, March 1, 1709," and "Francis Nicholson and Samuel Vetch to Earl of Sunderland, June 28, 1709," Calendar of State Papers, Vol. 24, Nos. 387, 604.

<sup>41</sup> "Samuel Vetch to Secretary Boyle, June 28, 1709," Calendar of State Papers, Vol. 24, No. 602. Vetch first reminded Boyle he had mentioned the possibility that Vetch would be named governor of Canada.

July 1, Charles Spencer, Lord Sunderland, Secretary of State, recorded in his journal that the Canadian expedition had been laid aside and all forces diverted to the retaking of the Bahamas.<sup>42</sup>

As the spring changed into summer, and the summer grew old, the provincial forces waited patiently for their English allies. While Samuel Vetch watched his grand dream and ambitions fade into the mists of time, he bombarded the London government with letters to remind them of their commitment to the colonies. In August he pointed out that the provincial forces had been under arms since May 20, "well clothed and exercised every day from that time."<sup>43</sup> In fact, the idle soldiers had been drilled so much Vetch could say "without the least boast ... that they both do the manuell exercise and fire in platoons and battalion equal to most regiments in the service."<sup>44</sup> But drilling soldiers accomplish very little except improve their drill, and all the while they continued to eat, and draw their pay and bounty money, "so that it is a vast expense to the Governments here; but what they chearfully pay in hopes of being

---

<sup>42</sup> Calendar of State Papers, Vol. 24, No. 606, 612. News of this change in plan was sent to the colonies on July 27, and did not arrive until October 11. See "Memoranda taken from Sunderland's book of Letters, July 1, 1709," Calendar of State Papers, Vol. 24, Nos. 658, 794.

<sup>43</sup> "Governor Joseph Dudley to Council of Trade and Plantations, August 16, 1709," Calendar of State Papers, Vol. 24, No. 691.

<sup>44</sup> "Samuel Vetch to Earl of Sunderland, August 2, 12, 1709," Calendar of State Papers, Vol. 24, No. 666.

freed hereafter." The obviously frustrated Samuel Vetch had a warning for the Earl of Sunderland as well. "The too late arrivall of the fleet," he wrote, "would be the last dissapoyntment to all H.M. Colonies who have so heartily and at so vast an expense complied with Her Royall orders, and would render them much more miserable then if such a thing had never been projected or undertaken."<sup>45</sup>

The British fleet never did arrive that summer, the ship carrying the message announcing the cancellation of the expedition, which left England the end of July, did not anchor in Boston harbor until early October. The summer of 1709 would not be the last time the provincials would wait in vain for British support, they would do so in 1746 and 1747,<sup>46</sup> but the experience of 1709 proved to be especially bitter. When news of the diversion of the British forces to the Bahamas arrived in October, Governor Joseph Dudley, Francis Nicholson and Samuel Vetch informed the Earl of Sunderland that the consequence of the aborted expedition "we fear will be very prejudicial to H.M. in more respects than one; Besides the total loss of the extraordinary charge

---

<sup>45</sup> "Samuel Vetch to Earl of Sunderland, August 2, 12, 1709," Calendar of State Papers, Vol. 24, No. 666.

<sup>46</sup> Isaac Hammond, ed., Miscellaneous Provincial and State Papers (Manchester, NH, 1890) New Hampshire Provincial and State Papers, Vol XVIII, 242-245. Theodore Atkinson wrote to John Thomlinson, Agent for New Hampshire, in November, 1746, "Pray let me aske you what is become of the Canada Expedition 'tis now the middle of November, we have not had one line from the ministry since the first letter of the 9th of April last, we have in the 4 New England governments now actually waitying near 5000 men."

of the Crown, and of those Governments, in the summer preparations, which will be a very heavy burthen, and a great discouragement to H.M. good subjects that have with all alacrity expressed their readiness and laid out themselves to do service for H.M., and their country, and to give check to the insolence of their enemies."<sup>47</sup>

In 1690 The provincial governments learned the bitter lesson that the financial costs of war were the same in victory or defeat, and now in 1709 they learned that even cancellation carried a price. The government of Massachusetts estimated they had expended almost £31,000 in the support of the abrogated 1709 expedition, in addition to the loss of trade and production through idle ships and workmen.<sup>48</sup> Little New Hampshire had contributed £3,500 it

---

<sup>47</sup> "Governor Joseph Dudley, Francis Nicholson, Samuel Vetch and Samuel Moody to Earl of Sunderland, October 24, 1709," Calendar of State Papers, Vol. 24, No. 794; Douglas Edward Leach, Roots of Conflict: British Armed Forces and Colonial Americans, 1677-1763 (Chapel Hill, NC, 1986), 28.

<sup>48</sup> "Account of Charges for Intended Expedition," Calendar of State Papers, Vol. 25, No. 81 iii: The account broke down as follows: Wages and subsistence for 973 officers and men between May 18 and October 14 - £12,973/18/8; Wages and subsistence for three ministers - £70/6/; Wages and subsistence for three doctors and assistants - £403/11/1; Coats provided the soldiers - £888/0/3; Hire of transports - £5272/10/9; Beer and water in casks put on transports - £669/4/10; Fitting transports - £467/7/1; 16 whaleboats - £160; Sloop equipped for war, wages and subsistence - £815/10/; Two vessels to guard coast in absence of Province galley - £1701/17/; Provisions with utensils - £5301/6/8; 38 drums with case - £83/12/; Building of barracks - £106/5/8; Clothing shipped for expedition - £1715/2/6; Ammunition - £120; "Charge upon 6 Maquas that came down to see the fleet" - £109; Total - £30,811/12/6.



could ill-afford.<sup>49</sup> In this instance the British government soothed the angered and disappointed colonists by reimbursing them for their cost. In fact, paying for expeditions, whether realized or not, became an important English contribution to the partnership.<sup>50</sup> While they continued this financial support throughout the remainder of the early French wars, payment often encountered the usual bureaucratic procrastination.<sup>51</sup>

In addition to financial backing, the London government contributed in other vital areas to the Anglo-American partnership. They provided much of the ammunition and occasionally muskets for the provincial forces. Although the New England colonies accumulated gunpowder through the imposition of powder duties on shipping tonnage, the amount barely covered their needs for defense of the frontier line.

---

<sup>49</sup> "Governor Joseph Dudley, Francis Nicholson, Samuel Vetch and Samuel Moody to Earl of Sunderland, October 24, 1709," Calendar of State Papers, Vol. 24, No. 794.

<sup>50</sup> See "Treasury Minutes for February 13, 1712," Calendar of State Papers, Vol. 26, No. 308, for reference to compensation for the reduction of Port Royal in 1710. Julian Gwyn believed the compensation for Louisbourg an "unprecedented action on the part of the British government" which "inaugurated a new policy by which colonies were partly reimbursed for their military expenses incurred on behalf of the Empire." But, actually, the precedent was established after the aborted 1709 expedition. - Gwyn, "War and Economic Change," Revue de l'U d'Ottawa, 47, No. 1-2 (1977), 126.

<sup>51</sup> For example, the final authorization for payment of the large Louisbourg debt did not come until five years after the fall of the fortress. See Hammond, ed., NHSP, Vol XVIII, "Duke of Newcastle to Governor William Shirley," 323-4; "Warrant for re-imbursing New Hampshire for expenses of Cape Breton Expedition, 1750," 383.

The extraordinary demands of major expeditions on powder and shot proved to be beyond the capabilities of the provincial supplies. For example, the shortage of powder had severely handicapped the 1690 Quebec expedition. Thomas Savage wrote his brother in England that the soldiers in the landing force each had around three-quarters of a pound of powder and fifteen to eighteen shot, which was soon used up in skirmishing with the French. "We sent aboard for Ammunition and Provision," related Savage, "but they sent us half a Barrel of Powder, which what that was you may judge, amongst near 1200 Men."<sup>52</sup>

In addition to the large number of soldiers involved, the use of artillery greatly increased the consumption of powder on expeditions, especially at Louisbourg where Pepperrell's army consumed great quantities. The 42 pounders captured from the French in the Grand battery each used sixteen pounds of powder per charge.<sup>53</sup> On June 2 he reported to Governor William Shirley that he was short of ammunition, and on June 7 that the army was "quite out of powder."<sup>54</sup> The capture of the French ship Vigilant alleviated that particular shortage, but in most instances, the British government provided the extra powder and shot

---

<sup>52</sup> "Thomas Savage to his brother in England, 1691," Colls. Mass. Hist. Soc., 2nd Ser., Vol. 3, 257.

<sup>53</sup> "Pepperrell Papers," Colls. Mass. Hist. Soc., 6th Ser., Vol. X, 144.

<sup>54</sup> "Pepperrell Papers," Colls. Mass. Hist. Soc., 6th Ser., Vol. X, 241, 266.

required for major expeditions.<sup>55</sup> As for muskets, Vetch requested British muskets in 1709 to ease supply problems by issuing provincials with standard calibers, but their use as an incentive for recruiting motivated the London government principally.<sup>56</sup>

A third major contribution by the English were the warships of the British navy.<sup>57</sup> The provincial governments did possess, or acquired, small vessels of war. Phips used a forty-four gun West Indiaman as his flagship in 1690,<sup>58</sup> and for Louisbourg in 1745, the colonies assembled around a dozen ships, the largest of which mounted twenty-four guns. However, these were no match for the large ships-of-the-line available to the French, and could not protect the transports.<sup>59</sup> The sixty-four gun Vigilant sent to supply Louisbourg could have easily destroyed the fragile provincial fleet if Peter Warren's squadron had not been present. Only the British navy had ships strong enough to keep the French away and support the land forces with fire power.

---

<sup>55</sup> See Chapter Six for more on ammunition supplies.

<sup>56</sup> Leach, Roots of Conflict, 51. See Chapters Six and Seven as well.

<sup>57</sup> "Governor Joseph Dudley to Council of Trade and Plantations, November 26, 1704," Calendar of State Papers, Colonial Series, America and West Indies, 1704-1705 (Reprint of 1916 edition, Vaduz, 1964), Vol. 22, No. 679; Thomas Hutchinson, The History of the Colony and Province of Massachusetts Bay (London, 1768; reprint Cambridge, MA, 1936), 53.

<sup>58</sup> Parkman, Count Frontenac, 245.

<sup>59</sup> Downey, Louisbourg, 59-60.

British regulars constituted another portion of the partnership, but not necessarily in a combat role. In the Anglo-American formula for the reduction of Canada the provincial soldiers would provide the assault forces, the redcoats would garrison the conquered land after the victory. The major weakness of the New England military system was a lack of soldiers willing to garrison forts. When William Phips captured Port Royal in 1690, his inability to leave a garrison nullified the victory. The French simply reoccupied the post. Provincial soldiers were more than willing to risk their lives in attacking French territory, but they firmly believed "reducing and garrisoning, be ... two things, quite different, and Distinct from each other."<sup>60</sup> In fact, the concept of enforced garrison duty at an isolated post was so abhorrent to New Englanders, recruiting proclamations for expeditions habitually included guarantees that no provincial soldiers would be required to remain behind against their will.<sup>61</sup>

In his original proposal for the 1709 Canadian expedition, Samuel Vetch simply requested two battalions of regulars be provided, but in his later clarification he left

---

<sup>60</sup> "T. W. Waldron and Jonathan Prescut to the Governor, Council and House of Representatives of New Hampshire, September, 24, 1745," Hammond, ed., NHSP, Vol XVIII, 238.

<sup>61</sup> Hammond, ed., NHSP, Vol XVIII, 105-6; "Francis Nicholson and Samuel Vetch to Earl of Sunderland, June 28, 1709," Calendar of State Papers, Vol. 24, No. 604.; See Chapter Seven for more on recruiting, provincial prejudice against garrison duty and the consequences of extended duty.

no doubt as to their purpose -- to garrison New France after the victory.<sup>62</sup> The Royal Marines who accompanied the provincial forces against Port Royal in 1710 did so not for their fighting ability, but to become the main garrison force for the captured fort. Provincial soldiers participated in expeditions "for Reducing, & not for garrisoning,"<sup>63</sup> and so the English partner had to provide redcoats for that ignoble and endless task.

Another important English contribution to the Anglo-American partnership were the military specialists who conducted the sieges. In Europe the risky nature of battle had led to an emphasis on slow and methodical siege warfare.<sup>64</sup> As a result, engineers and artillery experts became essential to military operations. The specialized knowledge needed to construct fortresses along prescribed and mathematically precise lines was also required by an attacking army to survey the terrain, pick the best artillery positions and direct the digging of trench works in order to bring the guns within effective range from which

---

<sup>62</sup> "Explanatory Supplement to Vetch's Cananda Proposal, November 17, 1708," Calendar of State Papers, Vol. 24, No. 196. Vetch wrote that 700 regulars were needed to garrison Quebec, 200 for Trois Riviere, 300 for Montreal, 200 for Port Royal, and 200 at Placentia.

<sup>63</sup> "T. W. Waldron and Jonathan Prescut to the Governor, [et. al.]," Hammond, ed., NHSP, Vol XVIII, 238.

<sup>64</sup> Henry Guerlac, "Vauban: The Impact of Science on War," in Edward Mead Earle, ed., Makers of Modern Strategy: Military Thought from Machiavelli to Hitler (Princeton, NJ, 1971, originally published in 1943), 34; Most battles that did occur had at their origin the need to relieve a besieged fortress or city.

they could breach the walls of the fortification.<sup>65</sup> Therefore, while the generals decided which target to invest, once the siege began, the engineers and technicians took over.<sup>66</sup>

While colonial defenses rarely reached the intricacies of European fortifications, the inclusion of artillery demanded the employment of gunners, and the recommendation of engineers as to their placement. Laying an artillery piece required adjustments to the height of the muzzle for the range and "training" left or right for the bearing, as well as the precise calculation of powder charge and knowledge of fuses used in exploding shells. Men with such mastery were rare in the colonies, and usually only found on the few small warships employed in colonial trade. Blacksmiths, through their association with small arms repair, were often expected to become, by some miracle, instant expert gunners.<sup>67</sup>

The number of guns in use at Louisbourg in particular underscored the acute shortage of gunners in the New England military system. As Samuel Waldo, commanding the Grand Battery, indicated to William Pepperrell, "we cant have too

---

<sup>65</sup> To prevent being enfiladed by enemy fire, a system of parallels were dug connected by zig-zag trenches.

<sup>66</sup> John Keegan and Richard Holmes, Soldiers: A History of Men in Battle (New York, 1985), 172-4; Guerlac, "Vauban," in Earle, ed., Makers of Modern Strategy, 30-40; Archer Jones, The Art of War in the Western World (Urbana, IL, 1987), 280-81.

<sup>67</sup> "Pepperrell Papers," Colls. Mass. Hist. Soc., 6th Ser., Vol. X, 138.

many of these usefull men."<sup>68</sup> Too many guns and not enough gunners led to dangerous experiments by amateurs, resulting in exploding barrels and the wounding or killing of precious gunners standing nearby. "I had the misfortune yesterday to be dangerously wounded," wrote one gunner to William Pepperrell, "... by the carelessness of one of my assistants who took upon him in my absence to load a gun when I was doing my duty at another bastion, who through ignorance gave that gun a double charge. I hope Your Honor will not impute the above to my fault."<sup>69</sup> One week later, on May 13, Samuel Waldo reported another gunner mortally wounded. Eventually he would order the loading of all cannons with cartridges, rather than ladles, so the charges could be prepared ahead of time by the experts, instead of loose powder dumped in by amateurs.<sup>70</sup> But he would also lament that "We are in great want of good gunners."<sup>71</sup> As a result of these shortages, the British furnished colonial expeditions with gunners from the Royal Artillery or, more commonly as Peter Warren did at

---

<sup>68</sup> "Pepperrell Papers," Colls. Mass. Hist. Soc., 6th Ser., Vol. X, 151-3. Waldo was requesting the use of "one Pratt ... who is a good operator in the armoury way."

<sup>69</sup> "Pepperrell Papers," Colls. Mass. Hist. Soc., 6th Ser., Vol. X, 155. "Samuel Rhodes to William Pepperrell, May 7, 1745."

<sup>70</sup> "Pepperrell Papers," Colls. Mass. Hist. Soc., 6th Ser., Vol. X, 191.

<sup>71</sup> "Pepperrell Papers," Colls. Mass. Hist. Soc., 6th Ser., Vol. X, 166-8. See also Louis E. De Forest, ed., Louisbourg Journals: 1745 (New York, 1932), 17, 18

Louisbourg, sent them ashore from the supporting Royal Navy ships.<sup>72</sup>

As the American colonies also provided little atmosphere for the development and training of military engineers, the British government usually assigned an officer to fulfill that need.<sup>73</sup> Responsible mainly for the building and maintenance of forts, the English engineers also provided assistance and advice concerning any offensive campaigns proposed by the provincial governments. However, when the professional soldier/engineers attempted to work with the civilian/military system of the New England, the cooperation was often tenuous and the relationship tempestuous. Learning that his replacement had been dispatched in early 1705, Colonel Wolfgang Romer expressed both his joy and relief in a letter to the Board of Trade.<sup>74</sup> "Return thanks

---

<sup>72</sup> "Francis Nicholson and Samuel Vetch to the Council of Trade and Plantations, Sept 16, 1710," Calendar of State Papers, Vol. 25, No. 396, reporting the cost of the "company of gunners and mattsos belonging to the [artillery] trainee"; "Pepperrell Papers," Colls. Mass. Hist. Soc., 6th Ser., Vol. X, 158, "Peter Warren to William Pepperrell, May 13, 1745."

<sup>73</sup> "Board of Ordnance to Council of Trade and Plantations, August 8, 1704," Calendar of State Papers, Vol. 22, No. 499. The Board of Ordnance assigned the engineer "for H. M. service in New England, New York and neighboring Continent of America." Many engineers came from the professional classes of Europe so their advancement was based on their specific knowledge rather than political or financial influence. An assignment to the New World, away from the main battlegrounds of Europe must have been a veritable exile.

<sup>74</sup> Romer requested a replacement because "he labours under a distemper not curable in those parts for want of experienced surgeons." - "Council of Trade and Plantations



for leave to come home," he wrote, "My pen is not able to expres the calamityes and contempts I have suffered and still do suffer."<sup>75</sup> But Massachusetts Governor Joseph Dudley also expressed his joy at the replacement. "Colonel Romer is a skilful officer, and served very well here," Dudley informed the Board of Trade, "but his temper is harsh and superior, and very disagreeable to the people."<sup>76</sup>

Dudley found the personality of Romer's replacement, Captain John Redknap, more agreeable, but like Romer, Redknap displayed caution when involved in provincial projects. During the debacle before Port Royal in 1707, when provincial forces twice attempted to take the French fort, the usual British-American prejudices and animosities contributed to the failure. In Redknap's report to London on the expedition he cited ground too marshy for proper artillery placement and reports of a French deserter that the fort held 500 soldiers and a year's provisions as causes for the defeat. But he also expressed discontent with the

---

to Board of Ordnance, Nov. 19, 1703," Calendar of State Papers, Vol. 21, No. 1287.

<sup>75</sup> "Colonel Romer to Council of Trade and Plantations, March 28, 1705," Calendar of State Papers, Vol. 22, No. 983. The "calamityes" would continue for Romer. On the return voyage eight years of work - all his papers and detailed sketches and drawings of the colonial fortifications he had built or maintained - had to be tossed overboard when his ship was captured by the French. Romer was held a prisoner of war in France for a while until exchanged. See "Romer to Council of Trade and Plantations, August 30, 1708," Calendar of State Papers, Vol. 24, No. 123.

<sup>76</sup> "Governor Joseph Dudley to Council of Trade and Plantations, July 25, 1705," Calendar of State Papers, Vol. 22, No. 1274.

provincial soldiers, saying that "we have no regular Companys in these parts (but Militia only) and are very difficulty governed especially in any action that is hazardous."<sup>77</sup> However, colonial impressions indicate Redknap was negative throughout the campaign, that he recommended ground not even be broken for trench works because their force was insufficient and disobedient, and the provincial soldiers in general "nott being persons proper for him to venture his reputation on."<sup>78</sup>

Such friction became a common by-product of the Anglo-American partnership. In Roots of Conflict, Douglas Leach has chronicled the disputes and animosity arising from the uneasy alliance between British regular officers and the provincial military establishment. The non-professional colonials in almost all cases had to conform to the methods and command of the regulars, and even then no amount of conformity could ever win the respect of the English professionals.<sup>79</sup> Redknap, as practically the sole regular in the 1707 Port Royal expedition, and certainly as supervising engineer, examined the undisciplined provincial soldiers and convinced himself the expedition was doomed to

---

<sup>77</sup> "Captain John Redknap to Council of Trade and Plantations, February 20, 1708," Calendar of State Papers, Vol. 23, No. 1347.

<sup>78</sup> "Lt-Governor John Usher to Council of Trade and Plantations, June 28, 1708," Calendar of State Papers, Vol. 23, No. 1592. For more on the problems of command at Port Royal see Chapter Eight.

<sup>79</sup> Leach, Roots of Conflict, 64-66.

failure, and his career along with it.<sup>80</sup> Most British officers agreed with Redknapp, and viewed the independence and ill-discipline of the provincials with a kind of horror. Commodore Charles Knowles reported to London after arriving at Louisbourg in 1746 that the provincials "were of so Obstinate and licentious a disposition that not being properly under Military Discipline there was no keeping them in any Order, and ... I rejoyce at getting rid of them."<sup>81</sup> Peter Warren found the Americans had "the highest notions of the Rights, and Libertys, of Englishmen, and indeed are almost Levellers, they must know when, where, how, and what service they are going upon, and be Treated in a manner that few Military Bred Gentlemen would condecend to."<sup>82</sup> Warren was actually fairly liberal in his attitude toward the provincials, believing that as long as they did their job, "every other Ceremony should in my opinion be winked at," and he let William Pepperrell run the land operation against Louisbourg. But in most Anglo-American expeditions, the British military took firm control. Certainly, for example, there was no question in 1711 that General Hill and Admiral Walker were in command of that joint venture. Even Warren

---

<sup>80</sup> The only other English officers were the captains of the small Royal Navy warships supporting the operation. They apparently agreed with Redknapp's assessment wholeheartedly.

<sup>81</sup> Leach, Roots of Conflict, 74.

<sup>82</sup> Leach, Roots of Conflict, 69.

asserted his authority after the fall of Louisbourg and began running the operation.<sup>83</sup>

For the individual provincial soldiers the problems and various contributions of the partners made little impression, they embarked on a great and exciting adventure to end the French menace once and for all, and pocket a little plunder along the way. Colonel John Storer of Wells caught the excitement when he left for Louisbourg in 1745, "Casting my care and burden, with my company, into the hand, care and protection of Almighty God, in the great important affair against the enemies of our sovereign Lord the King." As the provincial fleet left Boston harbor, the captain of Storer's ship fired a salute, and while the men "gave three huzzas" the salute was answered by the guns of the town.<sup>84</sup>

---

<sup>83</sup> "Pepperrell Papers," Colls. Mass. Hist. Soc., 6th Ser., Vol. X, 332-4, "Shirley to Pepperrell, July 7, 1745." Shirley reported he had been receiving complaints from the army that Warren was taking over. Warren, like Redknap, had probably been protecting himself and his career by letting Pepperrell run the land operation. First, with all the land forces provincial, his taking command would have been bad politics, but more importantly, if the operation failed, he could blame Pepperrell and the colonial soldiers. Once the fortress fell, he could take over without damaging his career, and even enhance it. Certainly as the years progressed Warren's recollection of the events placed more and more emphasis on his own contributions and that of the Royal Navy in the success of that operation.

<sup>84</sup> Journal of Colonel John Storer of Wells, Maine in the Expedition against Louisbourg, 1745 (type-written copy in the Maine Historical Society), March 19. During the firing of a second salute, an Indian was burned on the face by the powder flash, see entry for March 24.

Although begun with excitement and ceremony, the voyage taking provincial soldiers to their target often created problems of its own, principally an epidemic of seasickness. Benjamin Stearns found life at sea a harrowing existence. "The seas run mountains high," he recorded in his journal in 1745, "a terrible storm we had so bad that I thought that Every minut would be the last and in the mean while our men was exceeding [sick] and did vomit & as if they would dy."<sup>85</sup> Another soldier, describing the same storm, related that everyone on board was sick, and crowded together in the hold, while the captain of the vessel got drunk and passed out on the quarterdeck. Fortunately, one of the volunteers was an "old fisherman", who seized the helm and brought the ship safely through the storm.<sup>86</sup> The voyage to Quebec in 1690 took a month, during which time the soldiers, confined on their transports, succumbed to seasickness, small pox and other ailments, so many in fact that one third of the force was rendered unfit for duty by the time Phips dropped anchor in the St. Lawrence.<sup>87</sup>

Having survived the sea voyage, much of the initial enthusiasm remained as the soldiers disembarked at their destination. Storer described men building a blockhouse at

---

<sup>85</sup> "Journal of Benjamin Stearns" Proceedings of the Massachusetts Historical Society, Vol. 42, 137-44.

<sup>86</sup> De Forest, ed., Louisbourg Journals, 3.

<sup>87</sup> Samuel Adams Drake, The Border Wars of New England, Commonly called King William's and Queen Anne's Wars (1897, reprint of 1910 edition, Williamstown, MA, 1973), 62-63.

Canso as "cheerfully working and leveling the ground."<sup>88</sup> The soldiers at Canso were frequently entertained by the arrival and departure of Royal Navy ships, and even the sound of far off naval engagements.<sup>89</sup> Others found diversion in music, as the sounds of drums, trumpets, fifes and fiddles filled the camp.<sup>90</sup> Religious services and sermons inspired the less frivolous.<sup>91</sup>

When not actually on duty much of the soldiers' time was taken up with gawking and sight-seeing. One anonymous journalist at the siege of Louisbourg reported that during the first few days "many of the Army went Up towards the Grand Battray to Plunder (for as Yet, wee had no Particular Orders, -- But Everyone Did what was Right in his own Eyes)."<sup>92</sup> Much of this activity involved foraging for food. Soldiers hunted, picked berries, and plundered local farms. Such forays could be hazardous. During the 1707 Port Royal expedition, Captain Simon Wainwright reported that nine men "were led away by one Mansfield, a mad fellow, to the next plantation to get cabbages in a garden, without the leave and against the will of his officer. They were no sooner at their plunder, but they were surrounded by at least one

---

<sup>88</sup> "Storer Journal," Me. Hist. Soc., April 8.

<sup>89</sup> "Storer Journal," Me. Hist. Soc., April 23.

<sup>90</sup> De Forest, ed., Louisbourg Journals, 6.

<sup>91</sup> "Storer Journal," Me. Hist. Soc., April 8; De Forest, ed., Louisbourg Journals, 9. See Chapter Ten for more on religion in the life of the provincial soldiers.

<sup>92</sup> De Forest, ed., Louisbourg Journals, 11.

hundred French and Indians, who in a few minutes killed every one of them."<sup>93</sup>

Soldiers also indulged in the popular vices of smoking and drinking.<sup>94</sup> After the fall of Louisbourg, William Pepperrell established eight "houses of public entertainment" for use by the soldiers, and later that fall prices for various drinks were set by the British command.<sup>95</sup> The presence of spirituous beverages, and the tensions and disparate personalities, also led to fights and brawls. John Storer described one particularly lively bout at Canso in which "Capt. Montequé, with Capt. Bush, Capt \_\_\_\_\_ and others, held a drunken dangerous campaign - naked swords - and one pistol fired in the fray. Some pricked and some beat, &c."<sup>96</sup>

After listening to Louisbourg veterans describe their adventures in 1745, Jeremy Belknap wrote that "those who were on the spot, have frequently in my hearing, laughed at the recital of their own irregularities, and expressed their admiration when they reflected on the almost miraculous

---

<sup>93</sup> Hutchinson, The History of the Colony and Province of Massachusetts Bay, 126.

<sup>94</sup> "Narrative of Mr. John Wise, Minister of God's Word at Chebacco," Proceedings of the Massachusetts Historical Society, Series II, Vol XV, 292.

<sup>95</sup> "Pepperrell Papers," Colls. Mass. Hist. Soc., 6th Ser., Vol. X, 43, 50. Among the liquors mentioned were rum, Madeira wine, claret wine, cider, "(half pint of rum w/ beer & sugar (flip)" and "half pint of rum w/ water & sugar (punch)."

<sup>96</sup> "Storer Journal," Me. Hist. Soc., April 23.

preservation of the army from destruction. They indeed presented a formidable front to the enemy; but the rear was a scene of confusion and frolic. While some were on duty at the trenches, others were racing, wrestling, pitching quoits, firing at marks or at birds, or running after shot from the enemy's guns, for which they received a bounty, and the shot were sent back to the city."<sup>97</sup>

Of course, the frolic and enthusiasm of expeditions soon vanished in the reality of hard work, fear, sickness and death. Even mundane activities were colored by the grim atmosphere of their existence. The men at Port Royal massacred while foraging for cabbages were described by Simon Wainwright as "being mangled in a frightful manner,"<sup>98</sup> and a soldier at Louisbourg was interrupted while washing his shirt "when he saw a dead man carried by who had had his skull crushed by a shell fragment."<sup>99</sup> Gruesome as these sights were, the number of actual engagements involving provincial soldiers during expeditions was relatively small. The landing force at Quebec in 1690 had to drive away the French sent to oppose the landing, resulting in a short, lively fight which left four killed and sixty wounded on the English side.<sup>100</sup> At Port Royal in 1707 the provincial

---

<sup>97</sup> Belknap, History of New Hampshire, 278.

<sup>98</sup> Hutchison, The History of the Colony and Province of Massachusetts Bay, 126.

<sup>99</sup> De Forest, ed., Louisbourg Journals, 17.

<sup>100</sup> Drake, The Border Wars of New England, 63-65.



soldiers mainly fought off harassing ambushes and attacks by the French and Indian defenders, although one fight during the second siege resulted in sixteen killed and a like number wounded.<sup>101</sup> Francis Nicholson's attack on Port Royal in 1710 employed standard siege operations with the French surrender forced by artillery fire. At Louisbourg there was some skirmishing by scouts operating on the perimeter of the camp, but otherwise the disastrous assault on the Island battery was the only action to involve an infantry attack.<sup>102</sup>

Until the breach in the wall was opened by the artillery and the assault began, if any, soldiers participating in sieges served mainly as ditch diggers and pack mules. At Louisbourg they dragged the artillery by hand from the landing beach to the battery positions. "[The New Hampshire soldiers] were employed for fourteen nights successively," wrote Jeremy Belknap, "in drawing cannon from the landing place to the camp, through a morass; and their lieutenant-colonel Meserve, being a ship carpenter, constructed sledges, on which the cannon were drawn, when it was found that their wheels were buried in the mire. The men, with straps over their shoulders, and sinking to their knees in mud, performed labor beyond the power of oxen; which labor could only be done in the night or in a foggy

---

<sup>101</sup> Drake, The Border Wars of New England, 234-5.

<sup>102</sup> At Port Royal in 1690, Sir William Phips forced the surrender of the position by overwhelming forces.

day; the place being within plain view and random shot of the enemy's walls."<sup>103</sup> They also hauled powder and shot to the batteries, as well as provisions to the camp. One journalist described how the high surf impeded the efforts to unload the boats. "[Men] had to wade out to the boats and carry supplies to shore; ... then had to sleep in wet clothes."<sup>104</sup>

Such labor contributed to the wear and tear on provincial clothing, and it increased appetites for dwindling provisions.<sup>105</sup> Sleeping arrangements often exacerbated the discomfort. Initially, landing forces slept where they could find shelter. At Quebec in 1690, the Reverend John Wise described sleeping on straw in the farm buildings of local *habitants*, until the commander, John Walley, ordered them to the beach for embarkation, afraid, according to Wise, that the French might set the straw on fire. So they left their warm straw, marched about fifty rods and lay down on wet sand.<sup>106</sup> At Louisbourg some soldiers cut boughs to sleep on until tentage could be landed from the

---

<sup>103</sup> Belknap, History of New Hampshire, 277.

<sup>104</sup> De Forest, ed., Louisbourg Journals, 69. The provincial regiments at Cartagena were also used by the British as human pack mules. In one assault they carried no weapons, but bore the scaling ladders and fascines to be used by the regulars. Leach, Roots of Conflict, 56. See also Chapter Nine .

<sup>105</sup> See above.

<sup>106</sup> "Narrative of Mr. John Wise," Proceedings of Mass. Hist Soc., Ser. II, Vol. XV, 292-3.

transports.<sup>107</sup> Even when tents were provided, they often proved inadequate both in number and in quality. Simon Wainwright ordered his men to cut thatch to cover their tents at Port Royal in 1707, and at Louisbourg wounded soldiers apparently lay on straw exposed to the weather due to a shortage of tents.<sup>108</sup>

The sea voyage, lack of adequate provisions, clothing and tentage, plus exposure to unusual conditions and numbers of people resulted in a high proportion of sickness and death from disease on expeditions. Small pox crippled both the Montreal force and Phip's Quebec army in 1690. In 1707, Simon Wainwright, reporting on the condition of his men, wrote that "there is a considerable number of them visited with violent fluxes, and although we have things proper to give them, yet dare not do it; others taken with mighty swellings in their throats; others filled with terror at the consideration of a fatal event of the expedition, concluding

---

<sup>107</sup> De Forest, ed., Louisbourg Journals, 10.

<sup>108</sup> Downey, Louisbourg, 96. Downey condemned the inefficiency of the provincial forces in not providing adequate tentage, unlike the British in 1758 who did care for the comfort and health of their soldiers (158). Of course, the production and procurement of military tents was easier in England, where industry and artisans catered to the needs of the army, than in the colonies where the use of military tents was minimal. Downey could also have added that the British soldiers at Louisbourg in 1758 were more fortunate than their descendents in the Crimean War, whose commander landed them in a foreign land without any tentage. The resulting exposure contributed to the devastating cholera and dysentery in the British ranks. All things are, after all, relative. See Cecil Woodham-Smith, The Reason Why (New York, 1960), 160-71.

that, in a short time, there will not be well enough to carry off the sick."<sup>109</sup> Disease also devastated the ranks of the provincial soldiers at Louisbourg, especially after the fall of the fortress and during the following winter.<sup>110</sup>

While the final victory over New France would be reserved by the London government for Jeffrey Amherst, James Wolfe and the British army, the two-pronged assault they employed had been forged by the provincial governments in the previous French wars. And although never achieving their ultimate goal, the Anglo-American partnership did produce victory at Port Royal in 1710 and Louisbourg in 1745. Through all the frustrations of Quebec in 1690 and 1711, Port Royal in 1707 and the operations aborted by the British in 1709 and during King George's War, the provincial governments of New England learned about their strengths and weaknesses, and that their offensive projects were sound, even if the execution somewhat sloppy.

The initiation of a major expedition was not undertaken lightly. It put a strain on all segments of society by stripping it of provisions and manpower, and by disrupting the economy. Additionally, in an age of poor communication, the coordination of military forces on two sides of the

---

<sup>109</sup> Hutchinson, The History of the Colony and Province of Massachusetts Bay, 126.

<sup>110</sup> Leach, Arms for Empire, 242. For more on disease and medical concerning provincial soldiers, see Chapter Eleven.

Atlantic proved difficult at best. If anything, the Anglo-American partnership proved more adept at this coordination than the French. Most French expeditions contemplated against New England targets never passed the planning stages. In 1697 a French plan to capture Boston, then devastate the coastal towns between Salem and Portsmouth came to nothing when the French naval squadron arrived too late, but the French and their Indian allies in Canada, like the New Englanders in 1709, had been idle all summer waiting for their fleet.<sup>111</sup> During the summer of 1746, a French fleet set sail to recapture Louisbourg and then attack the coast of New England. The admiral in command died, his successor committed suicide a few days later, and 2,400 French soldiers and seamen succumbed to disease all without ever firing a shot in anger.<sup>112</sup>

Beyond the issue of success, or lack of it, the expeditions provided provincial soldiers with their only exposure to European style warfare. Of course fortifications were not as strong nor were the armies involved as large or complicated as in Europe. There were no major battles to force the issue, no Malplaquet to lift the sieges, only the gnat stings of French and Indian war parties fighting a style of war known only too well by the New Englanders. But expeditions, no matter how brief,

---

<sup>111</sup> Parkman, Count Frontenac, 382-4.

<sup>112</sup> George F. G. Stanley, New France: The Last Phase, 1744-1760 (Toronto, 1968), 17-18.

provided a glimpse at a world rarely seen by provincial soldiers. The drill, the vast fleets, the voyage itself, the uniforms of the regular and the naval officers, and the roar of artillery were never experienced, or for that matter needed, while patrolling "on the backs of towns" or lounging in frontier garrison houses.

Although this brief exposure proved exciting, New Englanders were rarely lured into a permanent life as a soldier. Expeditions served one purpose - the reduction of Canada and the elimination of the French threat to their families, communities and province. Provincials appreciated the assistance of Great Britain, the gift of weapons, powder and shot, the loan of warships and garrison soldiers, and the financial support, but they resented the contempt of the regulars who, as Douglas Leach has observed, "tended to look down on the provincials as something of an inferior breed -- crude, uncultured, undisciplined, and largely untrained in the science of civilized warfare."<sup>113</sup> The New Englanders knew the only answer to the devastation of their frontiers was the reduction of Canada, and as they could not accomplish this on their own, the Anglo-American partnership created a potentially successful final solution to the French and Indian problem, but in so many ways it became a necessary evil.

---

<sup>113</sup> Leach, Roots of Conflict, 164.

## CHAPTER SIX

### STORES OF WAR

In order to wage war effectively, to fight battles and conduct sieges, soldiers not only require the basic human needs of food, shelter and clothing, but they must also be provided with weapons and ammunition, the tools which define their profession and announce their intention. Throughout history the difficulties associated with keeping soldiers supplied, or "logistics", have increased as the technology of war has become more complicated. By 1700 European armies were generally followed by miles of supply wagons carrying the basics of food, shelter, clothing, weapons and munitions which would sustain the army and hopefully allow it to fulfill its ultimate purpose.<sup>1</sup> In provincial New England many of the basic human needs were supplied by the soldiers themselves. Rarely issued uniforms, they wore their own clothing. On the frontier they were often fed and sheltered by the people they were protecting, with the governments of Massachusetts and New Hampshire making up any shortages and providing replacements. Although expeditions and major

---

<sup>1</sup> John Keegan and Richard Holmes, Soldiers: A History of Men in Battle (New York), 221-5.

raids, as we have seen, demanded special measures, the basic needs of food and clothing were still met by the resources available in New England. However, the procurement of weapons and munitions proved to be a greater problem. Controlled by English mercantile policies which denied them an industrial base of their own, the New England colonies were constantly hampered in their war efforts by an inability to provide an adequate supply of weapons and munitions for their soldiers. Indeed, it can be stated that for the provincial governments of northern New England supplying their soldiers throughout the early French wars with muskets, powder, ball and flint was nothing less than a logistical nightmare.

In one respect this difficulty is surprising because of all the western societies, conditions in the English colonies had encouraged the most widespread use of firearms. In Europe weapon ownership was a privilege, a sign of independence and wealth.<sup>2</sup> In France only the nobility had the right to bear arms, the English linked a property qualification with owning a weapon, and in both countries only the privileged classes had the right to hunt.<sup>3</sup> Furthermore, before the refinement and increased production of firearms

---

<sup>2</sup> Lee Kennett and James LaVerne Anderson, The Gun in America: The Origins of a National Dilemma (Westport, Conn., 1975), 13; André Corvisier, Armies and Societies in Europe, 1494-1789 (Translated by Abigail T. Siddall, Bloomington, Ill., 1979), 9-10.

<sup>3</sup> In 1670 income of £150 per annum - Kennett and Anderson, The Gun in America, 22-23.



in the seventeenth century only the wealthy could afford them. However, the American colonies were founded at a time when firearms were becoming more efficient and cheaper to produce which brought their cost within reach of individuals of more modest means. The English transplants found that the environment of the New World encouraged the use of firearms. Instead of being a privilege, hunting was necessary for survival, and, more importantly, missile weapons were needed for defense as the natives would not stand still for the "push of pike".<sup>4</sup>

Consequently, the ownership of firearms by all adult males in the community was mandated by law.<sup>5</sup> In 1693, during King William's War, section five of "An Act for Regulating of the Militia" in Massachusetts stipulated "that every listed souldier and other householder ... shall be alwayes provided with a well fixt firelock musket of musket or bastard musket bore.... or other good firearms to the satisfaction of the commission officers of the company."<sup>6</sup> Even those excused from militia training were required to "be provided with Arms and Ammunition compleat, upon the

---

<sup>4</sup> Harold L. Peterson, Arms and Armor in Colonial America, 1526-1783 (Harrisburg, Penn., 1956), 7.

<sup>5</sup> Darrett B. Rutman, A Militant New World, 1607-40 (New York, 1979), 744.

<sup>6</sup> "An Act for Regulating of the Militia, Nov. 22, 1693," in Background of Selective Service (Washington, 1947), Vol II, Massachusetts Militia Laws, 139.

same Penalty as those that are obliged to train."<sup>7</sup> The ownership of a firearm was more than a privilege or a convenience, it was a social and a civic responsibility.<sup>8</sup> The militia acts of Massachusetts and New Hampshire made weapon ownership a prerequisite for the status of "freeman" as every young man who turned sixteen and every freed servant had three months to equip themselves with musket and ammunition.<sup>9</sup>

The administrative duties of militia officers included the supervision of firearms in their communities. Twice yearly they were required to inspect the condition and suitability of weapons, and check the munition supply of both the soldiers and the town. The care taken with such inspections, and compliance by the inhabitants, depended a great deal on the quality of the officers themselves and their nearness to areas exposed to the enemy. Much removed from the danger of immediate attack in 1744, John Chandler inspected his Worcester county militia regiment and reported that out of nineteen infantry companies and two troops of horse only four could be considered "mostly equipped".

---

<sup>7</sup> "An Act for the Regulating of the Militia, May 14, 1718," New Hampshire Militia Laws, Background of Selective Service, 57; "An Act for Regulating of the Militia," Nov 22, 1693, Massachusetts Militia Laws, Background of Selective Service, 45.

<sup>8</sup> Kennett and Anderson, The Gun in America, 45.

<sup>9</sup> "An Act for the Regulating of the Militia, May 14, 1718," New Hampshire Laws, Background of Selective Service, 51; "An Act for Regulating of the Militia, Nov. 22, 1693," Massachusetts Laws, Background of Selective Service, 138.

Seven were "entirely deficient" or missing arms and twelve were missing all or part of their ammunition.<sup>10</sup> The incentive for maintaining adequate arms and munitions, as well as the responsibility of militia officers and committees, obviously increased with the proximity of the frontier. As William Shirley cautioned Major John Storer of Wells, the town officers had to see the settlers were well provided with military stores, otherwise "if an enemy should come upon any place, and the people should be destroyed for want of arms and ammunition, I think their blood would be upon the officers' hands."<sup>11</sup>

Inevitably, however, even under the most diligent of officers, shortages of weapons persisted. Reasons varied, of course. Servants who performed active military duty, and minor sons, were to be supplied by the head of their household. But providing firearms for themselves, servants and all sons over the age of sixteen was an expensive proposition, so deficiencies were common in these circumstances.<sup>12</sup>

---

<sup>10</sup> American Antiquarian Society, Mass. Col. 1629-1869, Box 3, Folder 11: Militia returns, Officers commissions and Misc. Papers 1696-1762: John Chandler's Report.

<sup>11</sup> Herbert Milton Sylvester, Indian Wars of New England (Boston, 1910), Vol. III, 303.

<sup>12</sup> Although the laws stated boys who turned sixteen were required to provide themselves with weapons, the ultimate responsibility rested with their fathers. Men who had three sons in the militia were exempt from training, but according to law were still required to possess a weapon and ammunition. See "An Act for Regulating of the Militia, Nov. 22, 1693," Massachusetts Laws, Background of Selective Service, 139; "Petition of John Bowers and Others," James Phinney Baxter, ed., Documentary History of the State of Maine (Portland,

For many the cost of owning even one weapon was prohibitive. The militia acts attempted to compensate for such cases by ordering those unable to procure a weapon to provide corn or other "vendible goods" equal to one fifth greater value than the average price of a firearm, this amount to be determined by the officers of the company. These goods were then sold and a suitable weapon purchased, with any excess money returned to the soldier along with the weapon. Those too poor even to provide the necessary goods had to be armed out of the town stock of firearms. If single, they were assigned work by the town constable to pay off the debt, while married men in such circumstances were expected to provide a weapon for themselves, and return the town musket, as soon as possible.<sup>13</sup> For some men, at least early in the French war period, the lack of a weapon could become the means of escaping military service. When William Phips assembled his troops for his Quebec expedition in 1690, a large number appeared without weapons and Doctor Benjamin Bullivant described how eighty of them deserted *en masse* and "with hurra's, haveing beene told they must find theyr own armes."<sup>14</sup>

---

ME, 1897), Collections of the Maine Historical Society, 2nd Series, Vol. V, 52-3.

<sup>13</sup> "An Act for Regulating of the Militia, Nov. 22, 1693," Massachusetts Laws, Background of Selective Service, 140; "An Act for Setling the Militia, March 24, 1688," New Hampshire Laws, Background of Selective Service, 13.

<sup>14</sup> "The Journal of Dr. Benjamin Bullivant," Proceedings of the Massachusetts Historical Society, Vol XVI, First Series, 107.

In addition to cost, the natural attrition common to all mechanical devices contributed to weapon shortages. J. A. Houlding found that the average life expectancy of muskets used in the British army was eight to ten years, at which time they were supposed to be reconditioned and repaired. But rarely were they returned to army ordnance until the muskets had become dangerous to load. After reconditioning, these old weapons often were shipped to the colonies (see below). Therefore the life expectancy of weapons in the colonies depended on age and source, as well as the quality of original manufacture and the responsibility of the owner. Many soldiers appeared at musters with muskets that were unusable because they had not, or could not, be repaired. As Governor Joseph Dudley reported to the Board of Trade in 1703, "I am in great want of small Armes, those that we have have been so often repared ... tney ... are of Little Service."<sup>15</sup>

Military service on the frontier could be hard on fragile stocks and lock mechanisms, not to mention losses of muskets due to enemy fire or capture. Colonial agent George Vaughn reported to the Board of Trade in 1709 that weapons "are dayly lost in the woods in pursuit of the enemy."<sup>16</sup>

---

<sup>15</sup> "Joseph Dudley to the Board of Trade, Oct 27, 1703" in James Phinnev Baxter, ed., Documentary History of the State of Maine (Portland, ME, 1907), Collections of the Maine Historical Society, 2nd Series, Vol. IX, 161.

<sup>16</sup> "George Vaughn to Council of Trade and Plantations, March 1, 1709," Calendar of State Papers, Colonial Series, America and West Indies, June, 1708-1709 (Reprint of 1922 edition, Vaduz, 1964), Vol. 24, No. 393.

According to the militia laws, when a soldier had a weapon lost or ruined "not through his own neglect or default, such loss shall be borne by the publick."<sup>17</sup> The records of Provincial Massachusetts and New Hampshire overflow with requests to pay for firearms "shot to pieces with a Cannon ball,"<sup>18</sup> or weapons "split all in Pieces."<sup>19</sup> With so many soldiers killed or captured, the disastrous attack on the Island Battery at Louisbourg produced a great number of appeals for the compensation of lost weapons and equipment.<sup>20</sup>

Firearms were also ruined through carelessness and destroyed or captured in enemy raids on frontier communities. But beyond destruction, attrition and expense, shortages usually occurred simply because the population exceeded the available supply of weapons. "As the people grow more, the Armes grow fewer" wrote Joseph Dudley, and thus it was simple arithmetic which aggravated the problem

---

<sup>17</sup> "An Act for Levying Soldiers, Nov. 23, 1693," Massachusetts Laws, Background of Selective Service, 146.

<sup>18</sup> "Petition relative to a Slave of Theodore Atkinson who was in the Louisbourg Expedition," Isaac Hammond, ed., Miscellaneous Provincial and State Papers (Manchester, NH, 1890) New Hampshire Provincial and State Papers, Vol XVIII, 279.

<sup>19</sup> "Petition of Eleazer Young, Jr., Dec 14, 1744," Isaac Hammond, ed., Documents Relating to Towns In New Hampshire, "A" to "F" Inclusive, 1680-1800 (Concord, NH, 1882) New Hampshire Provincial and State Papers, Vol XI, 514. See Chapter Twelve for more on Young.

<sup>20</sup> For examples, see Hammond, ed., NHSP, Vol XVIII, 245-50

of arming provincial soldiers.<sup>21</sup> Colonial assemblies continued to reissue militia acts which demanded all adult males own a weapon, but there never were enough firearms in the colonies to make this ideal a reality.

The statutes required towns to keep a few spare firearms on hand for use by the local militia during drill, but when soldiers were raised for active duty, it was the responsibility of the provincial government to make up for any weapon shortages. A soldier without a weapon was not a soldier, and experiences like that described by Doctor Bullivant in 1690 (see above) convinced the government that soldiers could not be relied on to secure their own. But the problem of procuring suitable weapons was aggravated by the mercantile policies of the English government. Colonies, in mercantile theory, provided raw materials and in return purchased manufactured goods. The colonial monopoly on the production of these raw materials was protected as was the production of finished goods in the mother country, therefore, the mother country generally discouraged manufacturing in its colonies.<sup>22</sup> Because of this policy,

---

<sup>21</sup> "Joseph Dudley to the Board of Trade, Oct 27, 1703" in Baxter, ed., Doc. Hist. Me., Vol. IX, 161.

<sup>22</sup> "Council of Trade and Plantation to Governor Joseph Dudley, January 16, 1710," and "Ambrose Crowley to Arthur Moore, Council of Trade and Plantations," Calendar of State Papers, Colonial Series, America and West Indies, 1710-June, 1711 (Reprint of 1924 edition, Vaduz, 1964), Vol. 25, No. 34, 578; Arthur Cecil Bining, British Regulation of the Colonial Iron Industry (Philadelphia and London, 1933); Darrett B. Rutman, The Morning of America, 1603-1789 (Boston, 1971), 61.

and despite some limited iron foundries such as those at Saugus, Massachusetts, the New England provinces lacked a suitable means of iron and steel production, and without iron and steel firearms could not be manufactured.<sup>23</sup> Throughout the colonial period New England was dependent on European sources, particularly England, for new firearms or metal parts for repair and replacement. Indeed, this demand from the New World would help accelerate, in true mercantile fashion, the growth of the iron and gunmaking industry in England.<sup>24</sup> Appeals for the shipment of arms from the London government, "whereby We shall be able ... to Defend our selves," remained a constant theme in provincial correspondence to the Board of Trade.<sup>25</sup>

---

<sup>23</sup> Kennett and Anderson, The Gun in America, 40; Brown, 130

<sup>24</sup> M.L. Brown, Firearms in Colonial America: The Impact on History and Technology, 1492-1792 (Washington D.C., 1980), 130. By the last quarter of the seventeenth century the gunmaking industry in England had achieved a great deal of specialization as arms merchants contracted with gunsmiths who subcontracted with craftsmen specializing in barrel forging or lock making. These parts were then assembled by the gunsmiths who basically specialized in "stocking" or carving the wooden stock to receive the metal parts, a common practice in the New World as well, when they could get the parts from England. London had been the principle center of gunmaking in England, but in 1683 Birmingham gunsmiths accepted a government contract and by 1690 were producing 200 military muskets per month, and were about to enter the commercial market.

<sup>25</sup> "Answer to Sir Edmund Andros's Account of Forces raised, &c." Baxter, ed., Doc. Hist. Me., Vol. V, 124; examples of appeals for weapons are numerous. In July, 1704 Joseph Dudley wrote the Board of Trade that "I am in great want of powder and small arms ... the service and marching and removing will waste it away, and arms are every day lost and spoyled, which I cannot repair here." See "Dudley to Council of Trade and Plantation,



Normally, British weapons were shipped to the governments of New England where they became provincial arms. In 1704 the Board of Trade informed the Queen that 500 small arms had been sent to Massachusetts, and the Assembly would pay for them or "such persons to whom the said arms shall be delivered."<sup>26</sup> However, on other occasions the English military authorities by-passed provincial governments and directly furnished provincial soldiers with muskets as an enlistment incentive for colonial expeditions. For the proposed Quebec expedition in 1709 each volunteer was issued "a good Firelock, Cartouch-box, Flints, Ammunition, a Coat, Hat and Shirt; with an assurance of her Majesty's Princely Favour unto all such as should distinguish themselves", and for Port Royal in 1710 volunteers would "bear the Queen's armes and enjoy them as their own for ever."<sup>27</sup> Similar provisions were made for Cartagena and during King George's War as well.<sup>28</sup>

---

July 13, 1704," Calendar of State Papers, Colonial Series, America and West Indies, 1704-1705 (Reprint of 1916 edition, Vaduz, 1964), Vol. 22, No. 455. See also "Dudley to Board, Oct 27, 1703," Baxter, ed., Doc. Hist. Me., Vol. IX, 161.

<sup>26</sup> "Council of Trade and Plantations to Queen, February 16, 1704," Calendar of State Papers, Vol. 22, No. 109. In this instance, the ship sent with goods to pay for the weapons was captured by the French. See "Council of Trade and Plantation to Queen, November 7, 1704," Calendar of State Papers, Vol. 22, No. 645.

<sup>27</sup> "Enlistment proclamation for Port Royal, 1710," Calendar of State Papers, Vol. 25, No. 491 i.

<sup>28</sup> Penhallow, Samuel, The History of the Wars of New England with the Eastern Indians (Boston, 1726; Facsimile Reprint, Annotated by Edward Wheelock, Williamstown, MA, 1973), 50; Hammond, ed., NHSP, Vol XVIII, 105.

As the British government often used such opportunities to clear their store houses of out-moded and inferior weapons, they did not particularly care what ultimately became of the muskets.<sup>29</sup> However, the governments of Massachusetts and New Hampshire generally looked in horror at this practice no matter what the condition of the firearms. They habitually kept close watch on all government arms and the parcelling out of free muskets to volunteers by British authorities removed any control the colonial governments might have on their use.<sup>30</sup> The 1709 expedition in particular caused a great deal of concern because the muskets were issued to the volunteers but the expedition never materialized. Massachusetts authorities collected the muskets from the soldiers and put them in storage for "the defence of the Province in any future Expedition." As Governor Dudley explained to the Board of Trade, "if otherwise Absolutely given to the Souldiers, as by Some is Expected, [the muskets] will be soon lost or disposed, beyond any power of the Government to bring them into

---

<sup>29</sup> J. A. Houlding, Fit For Service: The Training of the British Army, 1715-95 (Oxford, 1981), 141: Shirley's and Pepperrell's regiments in particular sent inferior muskets, the practice would continue up until the American War for independence when Loyalist regiments were sent older model British muskets.

<sup>30</sup> "Letter Isaac Addington Secretary, to Joseph Prout," Nov. 14, 1689, in Baxter, ed., Doc. Hist. Me., Vol V, 7; "Pepperrell Papers," Collections of the Massachusetts Historical Society, 6th Ser., Vol. X (1899), 95

service again."<sup>31</sup> This action would set a precedent, and soldiers given weapons for other aborted expeditions, such as in 1711 and 1747, would find their muskets reclaimed by their officers before disbanding.<sup>32</sup>

Beyond the direct shipment of new arms from England, provincial authorities made up weapons shortages from town stocks or by pressing firearms from individuals not in active service. Indeed, beyond the obvious need for actual defense of their communities, the reason those men exempt from militia training had to own weapons was to provide a surplus which could be pressed when needed. Those individuals who had their weapons confiscated for government use received compensation. The search for miscellaneous firearms by provincial governments was constant, and it could lead to legal problems if the rightful owners were not compensated, as in the dramatic example of Captain Prescott's Muskets.

The saga of Captain Prescott's muskets began during the Cartagena expedition. As incentive for enlistment, the

---

<sup>31</sup> "Dudley to Board of Trade, Jan. 31, 1710" in Baxter, ed., Doc. Hist. Me., Vol. IX, 285.

<sup>32</sup> "William Shirley to Benning Wentworth, Oct 29, 1747" in Hammond, ed., NHSP, Vol XVIII, 325-7. "Joseph Dudley to Council of Trade and Plantations, December 2, 1712," Calendar of State Papers, Colonial Series, America and West Indies, July, 1712-July, 1714 (Reprint of 1926 edition, Vaduz, 1964), Vol. 27, No. 153. Dudley reported that the 1,000 muskets sent for the Walker expedition were divided between New Hampshire and Massachusetts. New Hampshire got 100, 50 placed in Fort William and Mary and 50 in commissary stores, and the Bay government kept 900, placing 100 in the Castle and the rest in commissary stores.

British government provided volunteers a musket which they were allowed to keep at the conclusion of the expedition. The British military authorities gave the muskets to company commanders, who were in turn responsible for their distribution to their men, the London government feeling it could cut down on administrative red tape by confining their involvement to company commanders rather than individual soldiers. Apparently Prescott and his men perished in that ill-fated siege, as did most of the provincial soldiers who took part. Somehow, whether they had never been issued to the company or were returned after the expedition, the muskets belonging to Captain Prescott and his company found their way to New Hampshire, where, in the Spring of 1744, Governor Benning Wentworth had them pressed and locked in Fort William and Mary for safe keeping.

A short time later the New Hampshire Assembly informed the governor that Captain Prescott's legal heir had surfaced and claimed ownership of the muskets. Recalling the precedent of the aborted 1709 expedition, Wentworth believed the fifty muskets still belonged to the British government and advised that until ownership was proven he would hold on to the weapons. Prescott's family sought an ally in their cause by appealing to Governor William Shirley of Massachusetts,<sup>33</sup> and Shirley wrote Wentworth on September 25, "at

---

<sup>33</sup> Although the records are hazy, it does appear that Prescott may have been from Massachusetts - Myron O. Stachiw, ed., Massachusetts Officers and Soldiers, 1723-43: Dummer's War to the War of Jenkin's Ear (NEHGS, Mass., 1979).

the request of the administrators of poor Captain Prescott and for the sake of his family." According to the royal proclamation, wrote Shirley, the arms provided to the soldiers would belong to them "or their representatives, if they are since dead," and therefore they have the right to demand their muskets from the representatives of Captain Prescott, "for as to the King the arms are sunk upon the distribution of them and the captains are accountable to the Crown only during the keeping up of the companies, and not after they are disbanded." In effect, as far as the British government was concerned, the fifty muskets were given to Prescott and their responsibility ended there. "I really can't see," concluded Shirley, "upon what just grounds your government can take the arms from the administrators without paying for them."<sup>34</sup>

Prescott's family kept up the pressure on Wentworth throughout the fall of 1744, and the governor was finally forced to admit the weapons did indeed belong to the Prescotts but was still reluctant to part with fifty stands of British muskets.<sup>35</sup> On December 19 Wentworth informed the Assembly that he had promised the Prescott family he would pay for the muskets or deliver them, and left it for the representatives to resolve the dilemma. The issue hung

---

<sup>34</sup> "William Shirley to Benning Wentworth, Sept. 25, 1744," Hammond, ed., NHSP, Vol XVIII, 211.

<sup>35</sup> A "stand" of arms consisted of a firelock and a bayonet, the bayonets having been made by contractors and individually fitted and paired to the muskets by the gunsmith. See Houlding, Fit For Service, 142.

there until a dramatic confrontation at the end of January, 1745. About sunset on January 31, a "Mr. Prescott who is the owner of the arms ... sent a carriage for the said arms" and demanded the Assembly pay for them or release the muskets immediately. However, the situation concerning the muskets had changed considerably since the previous fall. Governor Shirley had just proposed the reduction of Louisbourg, and if New Hampshire was going to support such an enterprise then fifty British muskets would prove very useful. The Assembly appointed Colonel Peter Gilman and Eleazer Russell as a committee to negotiate the purchase of the Prescott arms, and Governor Wentworth sent word that if the committee would take immediate action he would wait and settle the matter that evening. The committee met with Prescott's agent, Mark H. Wentworth, who, recognizing a seller's market, informed them he wanted twelve pounds per musket, a premium price. When the committee gave its report the apparently shocked and indignant House promptly voted unanimously to reject the offer, and then adjourned for the night. Two days later the fifty stands of muskets were delivered to the Prescott family and that seemed to end the matter as far as the government of New Hampshire was concerned. However, there would be a postscript to the story. A year later one of the participants in the ill-fated attack on the Island battery at Louisbourg petitioned the Assembly to replace his lost weapon and equipment. Joseph Ham described the musket he lost as "one of Prescotts

Arms Commonly So Calld" and requested £4/9/9. The Assembly paid him £/14/9 as compensation. So it seems the New Hampshire Assembly purchased one of the Prescott muskets after all -- at their own price.<sup>36</sup>

Soldiers issued weapons by the government had four pence a week deducted from their pay for their use.<sup>37</sup> This money enabled the government to pay the English for the muskets, or compensate the owners of pressed weapons.<sup>38</sup> Provincial officers were required to keep strict account of which of their men had been issued a provincial arm, and to collect them when the company mustered out. At Louisbourg, William Pepperrell ordered that company commanders collect all provincial weapons before their men embarked for home, and provide a list of apprentices and servants so their weapons could be collected or pressed as well.<sup>39</sup>

---

<sup>36</sup> "Petition from Louisbourg Soldiers, 1745," "Soldiers Losses at Louisbourg," Hammond, ed., NHSP, Vol XVIII, 245-9.

<sup>37</sup> "An Act for Levying Soldiers, Nov. 23, 1693," Massachusetts Laws, Background of Selective Service, 146.

<sup>38</sup> Bureaucratic mistakes were even common in the eighteenth century. On at least one occasion several soldiers had the charge for the use of provincial weapons when they had supplied their own. Six soldiers and one widow petitioned the New Hampshire Assembly because they had been "through some Mistake Charged with a Gun of fifty shillings price And the same has been Deducted Out of Our Wages." After swearing under oath to this information, the government paid each person their fifty shillings. See "Petition from Several Soldiers," Hammond, ed., NHSP, Vol XVIII, 292-3.

<sup>39</sup> "Pepperrell Papers," Colls. Mass. Hist. Soc., 6th Ser., Vol. X, Copies of Orders, May 26, 1745, 95.

In addition to procuring arms for those soldiers without, provincial governments were responsible for the maintenance or replacement of all weapons, private or government owned, used on active service. Naturally, because they were so far removed from the major population centers, the maintenance of weapons on the frontier or on expeditions was an especially serious concern. The disarray of the northern frontier after the Glorious Revolution created an acute problem with the repair of arms. Sylvanus Davis reported in August, 1689 that the only gunsmith at Falmouth had deserted to a pirate ship which appeared in the bay, taking with him three muskets and all his tools. Therefore, his garrison was in need of spare arms as "sevrell of our Arems Are ought of Kilter and noe Smith to Repaire them."<sup>40</sup> Jeremiah Swain reported the following October that the forces under his command needed an armorer "for we are exposed to send almost 20 miles to have our guns mended."<sup>41</sup> Two years later John March and Daniel King were obliged to leave a considerable portion of their raiding force at Greenland, New Hampshire due to illness and because the "badness of their Armes makes them very Insffitient for the Service."<sup>42</sup>

Sergeants sometimes carried mainspring vises and spare springs for quick repairs, but more involved maintenance

---

<sup>40</sup> Baxter, ed., Doc. Hist. Me., Vol. IX, 43.

<sup>41</sup> Baxter, ed., Doc. Hist. Me., Vol. IX, 66.

<sup>42</sup> Baxter, ed., Doc. Hist. Me., Vol V, 264.



demanded the work of experts, and there were very few gunsmiths on the frontier.<sup>43</sup> Blacksmiths performed simple gun repairs, and some did specialize enough to become known as gunsmiths. Sir William Phips' father was a blacksmith who settled in Pemaquid and soon became known as a gunsmith.<sup>44</sup> Charles Trafton was captured as a boy of twelve during the 1693 raid on York and was taken into the household of a blacksmith in Quebec where he learned gunsmithing. He continued the trade of blacksmith-gunsmith on his return to York in 1710.<sup>45</sup>

Because of the paucity of resident specialists, most of the gunsmiths who maintained the weapons of the provincial forces were themselves soldiers sent to the frontier. Wounded during the Great Swamp Fight in King Philip's War, Mark Rounds became a soldier-gunsmith on the Maine frontier, serving at Scarborough and Newcastle in the 1680's. He was at Fort William Henry in Pemaquid when the fort fell to the French in 1696. After the war, Rounds was stationed at Fort Mary in Saco, and later he apparently worked out of the new fort at Casco, at least he was listed in the company which dismantled that fort in 1715, and he subsequently settled in

---

<sup>43</sup> Brown, Firearms in Colonial America, 279. The Eastern Indians also needed access to a gunsmith and often made this a demand in treaty negotiations. In fact, the removal of a gunsmith from Falmouth became one of the stated causes of Dummer's War. See Penhallow, History of the Indian Wars, 88.

<sup>44</sup> Dwight B. Demeritt, Jr., Maine Made Guns and their Makers (Hallowell, Me, 1973), 1-2.

<sup>45</sup> Demeritt, Jr., Maine Made Guns, 6.

Falmouth.<sup>46</sup> Similarly, Ebenezer Nutting was a blacksmith from Medford who enlisted in Captain Joseph Heath's company during Dummer's War. When Colonel Thomas Westbrook ordered Heath to dismiss his company, the provincial commander arranged for Nutting to return to Falmouth as a "resident in the King's service."<sup>47</sup> Later he allowed Nutting to sail for Boston to get more tools, but wrote Dummer that "I think it of absolute necessity that he be sent down again as soon as possible, sundry of our Arms being out of Repair."<sup>48</sup>

When gunsmiths were unavailable on the frontier, other arrangements had to be made. The Bay government usually hired gunsmiths in the Boston area to maintain commissary stores and the weapons kept at the Castle. For example, in May, 1703 the Massachusetts Council reported paying Timothy Wadsworth £53 for repairing and "cleansing" the public store of arms during the previous year.<sup>49</sup> The following August, after the devastating attack on Maine communities which opened Queen Anne's War, the Bay government ordered that fifty weapons be sent to Kittery and fifty sent to Casco Bay "to be changed with the souldiers by order of the officers,

---

<sup>46</sup> Demeritt, Jr., Maine Made Guns, 3-4.

<sup>47</sup> Demeritt, Jr., Maine Made Guns, 6.

<sup>48</sup> William Blake Trask, Letters of Colonel Thomas Westbrook and others Relative to Indian Affairs in Maine, 1722-1726 (Boston, 1901), 111.

<sup>49</sup> "Minutes of Massachusetts Council, May 1, 1703," Calendar of State Papers, Colonial Series, America and West Indies, December 1, 1702-1703 (Reprint of 1913 edition, Vaduz, 1964), Vol. 21, No. 652.

taking in the defective arms and markeing them with the souldier's names, that they may be forthwith amended at their charge respectively, and to be restored to them."<sup>50</sup> Due to the distance and inconvenience involved in shipping weapons home for repair, provincial regiments on expeditions made sure they had blacksmiths along to serve as gunsmiths.<sup>51</sup>

The difficulty in maintaining weapons on the Northern Frontier was amplified by the bewildering variety of firearms carried by provincial soldiers. There was little standardization of military weapons anywhere during most of the seventeenth century. Calibers and lock mechanisms would be regulated in the British army during the reign of William and Mary, but the English would not establish an issue weapon for all its infantry until the 1720's.<sup>52</sup> Even if it had been financially feasible, and it was not, without an established gun-making industry standardization of weapons was impossible for the New England colonies. Provincial governments did attempt to regulate the privately owned

---

<sup>50</sup> "Minutes of the Massachusetts Council, August 21, 1703," Calendar of State Papers, Vol. 21, No. 1039. It is unclear how the weapons were actually to be repaired, but the specific precaution to attach the owner's name to each weapon indicates they were sent back to Boston.

<sup>51</sup> "Robert Tufton Phibbrook's Account, 1745," Hammond, ed., NHSP, Vol XVIII, 241-2; George Gilmore, Roll of New Hampshire Men at Louisbourg, Cape Breton, 1745 (Concord, NH, 1896); Rev. Charles Nelson Sinnett, Richard Pinkham of Old Dover New Hampshire and his Descendants East and West (Concord, NH, 1908), 23.

<sup>52</sup> Peterson, Arms and Armor in Colonial America, 164-5; Brown, 227; Houlding, Fit for Service, 138-9.

weapons used by provincial soldiers. For example, militia acts after 1690 generally required "a well fixt firelock musket of musket or bastard musket bore" and a barrel not less than three and a half feet long. But with weapon procurement so difficult, and shortages so chronic, the acts always included the loophole "or other good firearms to the satisfaction of the commission officers of the company."<sup>53</sup>

In one respect, the English colonies were somewhat ahead of their European contemporaries in recognizing the superiority of the flintlock, or "firelock", system. As early as 1646, the Plymouth General Court allowed only flint or wheellocks for town property. In 1677 Massachusetts placed an order for five hundred "new snaphaunces of firelock muskets,"<sup>54</sup> and at the start of King William's War

---

<sup>53</sup> "An Act for the Regulating of the Militia, May 14, 1718," New Hampshire Laws, Background of Selective Service, 51; "An Act for Regulating of the Militia, Nov. 22, 1693," Massachusetts Laws, Background of Selective Service, 139. The barrel length was important because infantry drill of the period called for three ranks firing volleys together. The muskets of the third rank, therefore, had to clear the heads of the front rank. As discussed in the chapter on Battle Drill, such formations were rarely used in provincial service, but the firearm regulations came under the jurisdiction of the militia as part of their administrative function. The militia did use British manuals to train on their muster days, thus the length of barrel was specified. Whether or not shorter barrels, such as the carbines used by mounted troops of militia, were accepted for provincial service is unknown. Most of the weapons served as hunting guns outside their military use (see below), and hunting fowlers of the period had extremely long barrels, some over sixty inches in length, so the problem probably rarely came up.

<sup>54</sup> Peterson, Arms and Armor in Colonial America, 45. The snaphaunce was an early form of flintlock which had frizzen separate from the pan.

requested one thousand "fuzies" from England. The "fusee" or "fusil" was a light musket primarily given to troops who guarded supply trains, troops who soon became known as "fusileers". Because of the ever-present danger of surprise attack, train guards could not rely on lighting their matches, therefore, the fusee always employed the flintlock system. By the 1690's provincial laws insisted soldiers provide themselves with "firelock" (i.e. flintlock) weapons.

Proven to be more efficient and reliable than its predecessors, the matchlock and wheellock, the smoothbore, flintlock musket had been adopted in western countries by the last decade of the seventeenth century, and it would remain the principle military arm until the 1840's.<sup>55</sup> The most commonly used type of flintlock in the late seventeenth century was the "doglock", so called because it had an external safety catch, or "dog", which hooked on to the back of the cock. After 1700 the doglock would gradually be replaced by the "true" flintlock whose internal design made

---

<sup>55</sup> George C. Neumann, The History of Weapons of the American Revolution (New York, 1967), 5. Recently, in A Wilderness of Miseries: War and Warriors in Early America (Westport, Conn., 1980), John E. Ferling wrote that the flintlock musket "was not terribly efficient; it could be fired only about four times a minute, and it tended to misfire frequently. Moreover, it was inefficient in damp weather and useless in the rain. The primeval forests of America rendered the weapon less useful than in the Old World (p. 12)." Inefficient compared to what? Compared to a modern M-16 the flintlock musket can be considered terribly inefficient, but compared to the matchlock (and the effect of damp weather on a lighted match can easily be imagined) the flintlock was indeed a far superior firearm.

the extra safety catch superfluous.<sup>56</sup> Although some specimens of muzzle rifling exist, the type of rifles often associated with colonial America did not exist in New England. Their weapons, like all European military muskets, were smoothbores.

Loading procedures changed throughout the Early French war period as ignition systems were simplified, and new techniques developed in the numerous dynastic and colonial wars. During the seventeenth century the main charge was carried in wooden tubes hung from a shoulder belt, called "bandeleroes" or bandoleers, the top was pulled out with the teeth and the charge poured down the barrel. Both top and tube were attached to the bandeleer by cords and were simply left to hang open. A ball was then removed from a leather pouch which was also attached to the shoulder belt, dropped in the muzzle with some cloth wadding on top to prevent the ball from rolling out again, and then both were pushed down the barrel with a rammer. To speed loading several lead balls could be placed in the mouth for easier access (the dangers of lead poisoning obviously being unknown).

Eventually the use of paper cartridges would simplify the process and eliminate the need for wooden chargers and bullet pouches. Both ball and main charge were rolled together in a paper tube, the tube torn with the teeth, powder poured down the barrel and ball and paper (which now served as the wadding) rammed down on the powder. Although

---

<sup>56</sup> Peterson, Arms and Armor in Colonial America, 28-31.

the use of paper cartridges was not reflected in military manuals until the 1730's, it appears they were already becoming popular during King William's War. Sylvanus Davis listed "cartridge boxes" taken by some soldiers who deserted from Fort Loyal in 1689 and the Militia Act of 1693 required "badeleers or cartouch-box".<sup>57</sup>

Once the main charge had been rammed home, priming powder was poured into the pan then the "hammer" or frizzen closed over it. Until the 1730's, priming was always carried in a separate container, either a bottle shaped flask or, more commonly in the case of provincial soldiers, a powder horn. Although the printed manuals do not reflect it until much later, by 1745 it was becoming common to prime from the cartridge, a practice which increased loading speed considerably.<sup>58</sup> Soldiers on the Louisbourg campaign, for example, were ordered to "allow as much powder in each cartridge as will be sufficient to prime too."<sup>59</sup> When priming from cartridge the procedure had to be reversed, the pan primed and the hammer closed, then the rest of the charge poured down the barrel.

---

<sup>57</sup> Baxter, ed., Doc. Hist. Me., Vol. IX, 29; "An Act for Regulating of the Militia, Nov. 22, 1693," Massachusetts Laws, Background of Selective Service, 139.

<sup>58</sup> Houlding, Fit For Service, 147.

<sup>59</sup> AAS, Curwen Family Papers, Box 3, folder 1. See Chapter Ten for the effects of loading practices on firing speed.

A piece of flint, wrapped in sheet lead or a square of leather and held tightly in the jaws of the cock, ignited the weapon when it struck the face of the hammer and pushed it forward. As the flint hit the hammer, or frizzen, it scraped off tiny pieces of metal. Red hot from the friction, these "sparks" fell on the priming powder in the pan, ignited it, and the resulting flame found the main charge in the barrel through the flash hole. In order to produce these sparks the metal in the hammer had to be hardened (rehardening was a common repair for blacksmith-gunsmiths) and the flint had to be sharp. Most flints averaged around thirty strikes before they had to be re-sharpened, or "re-knapped." This could be accomplished by gently tapping the striking face with a metal object to carefully flake the flint away or by turning the flint over to allow the action of striking the hammer to chip the flint away. Every flint was different, however. Some bore fifty, sixty or seventy strikes without re-knapping while others shattered after a few blows. In combat situations there was no time to fool around with re-knapping and flints were replaced as soon as they began to fail.<sup>60</sup>

Soldiers also needed cleaning equipment to maintain their firearms, and the Militia Acts generally required them

---

<sup>60</sup> Brown, Firearms in Colonial America, 70; My own experience with flints has shown they can be very inconsistent as to length of service.



to have a "worm and priming-wire fit for his gun."<sup>61</sup> Without cleaning, the powder fouling in the barrel would eventually render the weapon useless by preventing the ball from being rammed home. The "worm", which screwed on the end of the rammer, gripped a cleaning patch and enabled the barrel to be wiped out. The priming-wire kept the flash hole clear, otherwise flame from the priming powder would not ignite the main charge - a "flash in the pan".<sup>62</sup> In addition to cleaning equipment, provincial soldiers often had lock covers (a piece of leather molded to shape and tied around lock) and a tompion, or wooden plug, for the muzzle to keep rain or snow from wetting the powder charge.<sup>63</sup>

The calibers of provincial firearms varied as much as the weapons themselves. Non-military firearms generally were sold with a ball mold specifically made for the bore size of the weapon.<sup>64</sup> The English bore system was based on the number of balls which could be cast from a pound of

---

<sup>61</sup> "An Act for the Regulating of the Militia, May 14, 1718," New Hampshire Laws, Background of Selective Service, 51; "An Act for Regulating of the Militia, Nov. 22, 1693," Massachusetts Laws, Background of Selective Service, 139.

<sup>62</sup> During Lovewell's fight, according to the legend, the Chief Paugus was killed when both he and John Chamberlain met at the edge of the pond to clean their fouled weapons. See Chapter on Combat for more on this incident -- George W. Chamberlain, "John Chamberlain, The Indian Fighter at Pigwacket," Collections and Proceedings of the Maine Historical Society, Second Series, Vol. IX, 8.

<sup>63</sup> Brown, Firearms in Colonial America, 138.

<sup>64</sup> Brown, Firearms in Colonial America, 128.

lead, thus a "16 bore" meant sixteen shots to the pound. The bore size could refer to either the diameter of the ball or the measurement inside of the barrel. For ease of loading and to compensate for powder fouling, firearms generally employed a ball that was actually much smaller than the bore of the barrel, the difference being called "windage". Thus a musket with a 10 bore barrel, like the standard British infantry musket, generally loaded a 12 bore ball. Obviously, a great deal of confusion can result if references are not specific. The alternate method of determining caliber was to measure the bore in hundredths of an inch, with a 10 bore barrel measuring out to be about .78.<sup>65</sup>

The militia acts of New England required members of the militia to procure a weapon of "musket or bastard musket bore". With the ascension of William and Mary to the throne, the British military adopted the Dutch bore system for their military weapons, and so musket bore referred to the Dutch 10 bore barrel which fired a 12 bore ball. The exact meaning of "bastard musket bore" has eluded modern scholars, but apparently meant a smaller caliber, probably the Dutch carbine caliber (16 bore barrel) which the British would later adopt for its own carbines and fusils.<sup>66</sup> The French used a .69 caliber musket and many New England hunting guns or fowling pieces also utilized this caliber,

---

<sup>65</sup> Brown, Firearms in Colonial America, 13, 51

<sup>66</sup> Brown, Firearms in Colonial America, 86; Neumann, The History of Weapons, 114.

which by English standards meant a 13 or 14 bore barrel. Weapons made for the Indian trade catered to the native's preference for a dual purpose weapon which would serve for both hunting and war with an even smaller caliber to reduce their consumption of powder and lead. Gradually reduced in size throughout the colonial period, Indian trade guns eventually would employ a 24 bore ball, enabling the Indians to get twice as many shots out of pound of lead than the typical British soldier.<sup>67</sup>

Like the Indian, most New England men owned a weapon that served both for hunting and military service, and they preferred a lighter caliber which consumed less powder and lead. Military fusils with 16 bore barrels, such as those requested by Massachusetts in 1690, were popular as were 13 bore fowling pieces and 20 or 24 bore trade guns.<sup>68</sup> Mixed with 10 bore military muskets and odd size miscellaneous weapons, this hodgepodge of calibers created logistical problems even greater than the supply of the weapons themselves.

The militia acts of Massachusetts and New Hampshire required company members to provide "one pound of good powder, twenty bullits fit for his gun, and twelve flints", and both governments ordered individual communities to keep a common stock of powder and shot -- usually a barrel of

---

<sup>67</sup> Brown, Firearms in Colonial America, 153; Neumann, The History of Weapons, 64; Charles E. Hanson, Jr., The Northwest Gun (Lincoln, Nebraska, 1955), 2, 6-7.

<sup>68</sup> Brown, Firearms in Colonial America, 140.

powder, two hundred pounds of balls and three hundred flints for every sixty soldiers on their rolls.<sup>69</sup> This supply of powder, lead and flints had to come from outside sources because, as in the case of weapons, there were no domestic supplies. In 1642 Massachusetts had attempted to produce its own source of saltpeter, and established powder mills in 1666, and later more successfully in 1675, but demand far exceeded the supply.<sup>70</sup> The most important source of powder in the English colonies was a duty on shipping tonnage to be paid in gunpowder.<sup>71</sup> The duty was assessed on all ships not owned by residents of the colony, and without it, according to Governor Joseph Dudley, "the Province would be undone for want of powder, being no waies able to supply themselves."<sup>72</sup> However, the powder duty did not produce lead and flints, and the powder received from it only covered normal levels

---

<sup>69</sup> "An Act for Regulating of the Militia, Nov. 22, 1693," Massachusetts Laws, Background of Selective Service, 139, 141; "An Act for the Regulating of the Militia, May 14, 1718," New Hampshire Laws, Background of Selective Service, 51, 55; "Selectmen to provide full stock of Ammunition, Feb. 10, 1691," Baxter, Doc. Hist. Me., Vol V, 176.

<sup>70</sup> Brown, Firearms in Colonial America, 127

<sup>71</sup> Rutman, A Militant New World, 325; Kennett and Anderson, The Gun in America, 41.

<sup>72</sup> "Dudley to Council of Trade and Plantations, July 25, 1705," Calendar of State Papers, Vol. 22, No. 1274. The duty was usually one pound of "good new powder for every tun such ship or vessel is in burthen." In periods of peace captains could substitute a payment of twelve pence per ton, but during war the New England governments insisted the duty be paid in powder. See "An Act that the Duty of Tunnage of Shipping be Paid in Powder" passed on June 27, 1702 in Massachusetts Laws, Background of Selective Service, 156.

of activity. In the end supplies of munitions, like the firearms, had to come directly from England.

As it had in so many instances, the Glorious Revolution inhibited the ability of the New England governments to provide their soldiers with the munitions necessary to wage war. On March 14, 1690 taxes levied to pay for the war effort included payment for a "Dispatch for England to their Majesties providing of Amunition."<sup>73</sup> In addition to the 1,000 fusees previously mentioned, the request dispatched in early May asked for "200 Barrells pistoll powder 50 Barrells Common Powder 20 tunn Lead."<sup>74</sup> It was the wait for these requested supplies which caused the fatal delay in sailing for Quebec later that summer. On June 12, the Board of Trade approved a shipment of 500 fusees, 200 barrels of powder and 12 tons of lead, but it could not be shipped in time.<sup>75</sup>

The repeated requests by the government of Massachusetts for powder and shot during the early years of King William's War seriously hampered the negotiations for a new charter. Increase Mather wrote from London that the constant call for aid "was, in effect, to pray for a [Royal]

---

<sup>73</sup> "Ten Single Rates to be Levied. March 14, 1690," in Baxter, ed., Doc. Hist. Me., Vol V, 50.

<sup>74</sup> "Answer to Sir Edmond Andros's Account of Forces raised, &c., May 30, 1690," in Baxter, ed., Doc. Hist. Me., Vol V, 124.

<sup>75</sup> "Report of the Lords of Trade and Plantations, June 12, 1690," Calendar of State Papers, Colonial Series, America and West Indies, 1689-1692 (Reprint of 1903 edition, Vaduz, 1964), Vol. 13, No. 941.

Governor. They could not be so weak as to think the King would send one without the other."<sup>76</sup> Increase Mather's analysis of the situation was apparently astute. According to historian Richard Johnson, the entreaties for powder, lead and flints and other war materials throughout the early French wars led to much closer ties with the government in London.<sup>77</sup> As Lieutenant Governor Stoughton wrote in 1701, the colonies depended "on his Majesties Princely care of us in affording us such Supplies of Warlike Stores and provision" for without ammunition supplies from England the war against the French and Indian enemy could not be waged.<sup>78</sup> Shortages of powder and lead limited the scope and

---

<sup>76</sup> Richard R. Johnson, Adjustment To Empire: The New England Colonies, 1675-1715 (Rutgers University Press, 1981), 128.

<sup>77</sup> Johnson, Adjustment To Empire, 130. The British government was not always enamored of this dependence. With a heavy commitment to King William's war against Louis XIV, the constant appeals from Massachusetts caused irritation. In 1695 the Board of Trade, in approving yet another request from the Bay colony, wrote "as to stores of war, it has not hitherto been usual that Massachusetts (being the most considerable Colony on the Continent) should demand or that the King should grant them, and we think it very reasonable that the people should rather be pressed themselves to use their utmost efforts in their defense, Nevertheless we think that ten pieces of cannon and 100 barrels of powder should be sent out with Lord Bellomont." See "Council of Trade and Plantation to the Queen, 1695," Calendar of State Papers, Colonial Series, America and West Indies, May 1696 to October, 1697 (Reprint of 1903 edition, Vaduz, 1964), Vol. 15, No.

<sup>78</sup> Baxter, ed., Doc. Hist. Me., Vol. IX, 111. The dependency was not cheap either. The British government estimated that the stores of war needed for the New England colonies in 1703 would cost over £3,215. See "Orders of Queen in Council, June 10, 1703," Calendar of State Papers, Vol. 21, No. 813.

number of scouts, raids and expeditions, and caused unforeseen problems in strategic and tactical plans.<sup>79</sup>

Receiving stores of war from the Crown involved much more than making a simple request. Like the proposals for expeditions, colonial appeals for powder, shot and weapons had to negotiate the bureaucratic labyrinth known as the British government. In October, 1707, the government of New Hampshire penned a request for stores of war, because "At present wee labor under a great want of good small armes and ammunition, which are daily waisted and lost in the Wilder-nesse, in persuite of the Enemy. And by reason of our

---

<sup>79</sup> The delay of the Phips' expedition in 1690 is only the more famous incident. Provincial artillery fire at Louisbourg was curtailed due to powder shortages, and Fort Massachusetts fell in 1746 partially because of lack of ammunition. The fort surrendered when the defenders were down to four pounds of powder. (See Jeremy Belknap, The History of New Hampshire (Reprint of 1831 edition, New York, 1970) Vol 1, 291; Sylvester, Indian Wars of New England, Vol. III, 370-5). Of course, the problems of munition supply were not confined to the English colonies. The Eastern Indians had similar, if not greater difficulties, in maintaining an adequate supply of powder and lead, especially when the French were not directly involved in a campaign. During the destruction of York, Maine in 1693 the Indians were seen ripping the lead glazing from windows and stealing pewter plates for molding into musket balls. (See "Letter from Captain John Floyd to the Governor and Council, Jan. 27, 1691," in Baxter, ed., Doc. Hist. Me., Vol V, 314) Any battle or skirmish with the Eastern Indians such as Church's raids or Lovewell's fight, even if not a tactical success, could be a strategic victory by forcing the Indians to use up precious supplies of ammunition, resulting in at least a truce while they replenished their stock from the French, or even their former enemies. See Cotton Mather, Decennium Luctuosum (1699, reprinted in Charles H. Lincoln, ed., Narratives of the Indian Wars, 1675-1699, New York, 1913), 268-9

poverty cannot be supplied."<sup>80</sup> This appeal was not formally presented to the Board of Trade until the following July, when colonial agent George Vaughn specified types and amounts of stores needed. Vaughn emphasized the need for quick action because "the circumstances of that Province are such as do require a speedy supply, and therefore we desire your Lordship would receive H. M. pleasure upon the said Addresses as soon as conveniently may be."<sup>81</sup>

The Board of Trade passed the request along to the Secretary of State on July 19 who returned it ten days later. With the Secretary's approval, the Board of Trade launched its usual fact finding investigation to determine the actual needs of New Hampshire. On August 17 they wrote the Board of Ordnance for a list of what stores had previously been sent to the province, and they also asked the former colonial military engineer, Colonel Wolfgang Romer, for his assessment of New Hampshire's request.<sup>82</sup> One week later the Board of Ordnance informed the Board of Trade that stores of war had been last sent specifically to New Hamp-

---

<sup>80</sup> "New Hampshire Council and Assembly to the Queen, October 22, 1707 (received July 29, 1708)," Calendar of State Papers, Vol. 24, No. 65 ii.

<sup>81</sup> "George Vaughn to Council of Trade and Plantations, July 15, 1708," Calendar of State Papers, Vol. 24, No. 45; "Council of Trade and Plantations to Charles Spencer, Earl of Sunderland, Secretary of State, July 19, 1708," Calendar of State Papers, Vol. 24, No. 54.

<sup>82</sup> "Council of Trade and PLantations to Col. Romer, August 17, 1708," Calendar of State Papers, Vol. 24, No. 92; "Council of Trade and Plantations to Board of Ordnance, August 17, 1708," Calendar of State Papers, Vol. 24, No. 93.



shire in July, 1692, but that frequent shipments had been sent to Massachusetts which "might have been sent to New Hampshire."<sup>83</sup>

Romer's reply took two weeks and he seems to have misunderstood the needs of New Hampshire in making their appeal. Apparently Romer thought the requested supplies were meant for Fort William and Mary exclusively. He described the installation in great detail, and its defensive status when he left the colonies. As for the provincial request, "the powder demanded seems to me extraordinary and surprising, unless they intend to merchandize therewith, because I am certain the powder-house will not contain that quantity, and I cannot imagine what use they can make of so much powder, when I consider what quantity they receive yearly from the shipping which comes to the province."<sup>84</sup>

On November 8, 1708, the Board of Trade recommended that New Hampshire be sent the stores of war, including small arms and powder, shot and lead, adding that New Hampshire had not received a shipment since 1692.<sup>85</sup> On November 25 the Queen in Council asked the Board of Ordnance to make "an estimate of the charge of the ordnance stores

---

<sup>83</sup> "Board of Ordnance to Council of Trade and Plantations, August 24, 1708," Calendar of State Papers, Vol. 24, No. 114.

<sup>84</sup> "Col. Romer to Council of Trade and Plantation, August 30, 1708," Calendar of State Papers, Vol. 24, No. 123.

<sup>85</sup> "Council of Trade and Plantations to Queen, November 8, 1708," Calendar of State Papers, Vol. 24, No. 185.

proposed for New Hampshire."<sup>86</sup> Now the Board of Ordnance had to conduct its own investigation, some of which repeated ground already covered. For example, on January 18, 1709, Ordnance asked the Board of Trade for copies of the Romer report they had received the previous summer, and the Board of Trade complied the following day.<sup>87</sup>

On January 27, 1709, the Queen in Council finally ordered the stores of war be sent to New Hampshire.<sup>88</sup> Two weeks later the Board of Trade admonished Governor Joseph Dudley to send the stores to his northern province only when absolutely necessary, and to submit regular accounts.<sup>89</sup> Apparently Romer's remarks about possible intention to "merchandize" the powder had had its effect. But while the approval had been given, the stores themselves had to be gathered, loaded on ships, and those ships provided armed escort against the prowling French navy. On October 25, 1709, Governor Joseph Dudley wrote to the Board of Trade acknowledging the arrival, "a few dayes since," of the ship

---

<sup>86</sup> "Orders of Queen in Council, November 25, 1708," Calendar of State Papers, Vol. 24, No. 205.

<sup>87</sup> "Board of Ordnance to Council of Trade and Plantations, January 18, 1709," Calendar of State Papers, Vol. 24, No. 306.

<sup>88</sup> "Order of Queen in Council, January 27, 1709," Calendar of State Papers, Vol. 24, No. 332.

<sup>89</sup> "Council of Trade and Plantations to Governor Dudley, February 11, 1709," Calendar of State Papers, Vol. 24, No. 354.

Supply "bringing H. M. stores for Piscataqua."<sup>90</sup> Almost two years to the day after the government of New Hampshire made its original request, the stores of war arrived in port.<sup>91</sup>

The arrival of supplies from England did not end the logistical problems connected with munitions, for distribution caused as many headaches as acquisition. Stored in barrels generally containing about one hundred pounds, powder had to be transported from the coast to individual towns or sent along with military forces where eventually it

---

<sup>90</sup> "Governor Dudley to Council of Trade and Plantations, October 25, 1709," Calendar of State Papers, Vol. 24, No. 797.

<sup>91</sup> It comes as no surprise to learn that provincial governments were touchy about the waste of powder. Lt-Governor John Usher of New Hampshire, who was never popular to begin with, found himself attacked for wasting powder in useless salutes to his person, especially the powder sent from England in 1692. The fact that Usher lived outside the colony, which irritated the inhabitants, meant that he was constantly sailing in and out of Portsmouth harbor, and so the fort was constantly firing a salute to his ship. William Vaughn wrote to the Board of Trade in 1703 that there were only 30 barrels of the original 100 left at William and Mary. Usher refuted this charge, claiming that "some few guns were fired two or three times a year by the Captain of the Fort as a piece of respect to him, but without his order." The British government backed up their Lt-Governor in this instance, but the charges of powder wastage continued to haunt Usher. In 1710 the New Hampshire Council complained to Governor Dudley that Usher, among numerous indiscretions, had wasted nine to eleven barrels of powder in salutes fired to his person. Dudley, who had had a falling out with Usher, agreed with the New Hampshire Council. See "William Vaughn to Council of Trade and Plantations, May 10, 1703," Calendar of State Papers, Vol. 21, No. 672; "Lt-Governor John Usher to Council of Trade and Plantations, May 16, 1703," Calendar of State Papers, Vol. 21, No. 698; "New Hampshire Council to Governor Dudley, November 11, 1710," Calendar of State Papers, Vol. 25, No. 507 i.

would be used to fill powder horns, bandoleers or cartridges. Although blocks of flint were used as ballast in ships coming from England, such flint was useless unless it was broken down and shaped for use in firearms. Gun flints used in the colonies were shaped and knapped in England and packed in half-kegs for shipment. The flints would be sized for pistol, carbine or musket and would need a wrapping of lead or leather to hold it in the jaws of the cock. British army flints were pre-wrapped in lead for easy changing in the field, otherwise one strip of leather or lead would have to serve many flints.

Lead came to the colonies in the form of bars, sheets, or precast into balls which were separated into small kegs according to caliber. The variety of calibers used by provincial soldiers made the distribution of lead most difficult. Kegs of pre-cast balls were broached and the men chose bullets closest to their calibers. Otherwise the balls had to be melted down again and recast with individual molds. Papers had to be cut to shape, powder charges measured, and then the ball and powder rolled into cartridges.<sup>92</sup> The discovery in the heat of action that the kegs of musket balls were of the wrong caliber could invite disaster, as Benjamin Church found to his regret one frantic day in 1689. During the Battle of Brackett's Woods, Church was informed that the casks of bullets brought on shore were all musket caliber and thus too large for most of the

---

<sup>92</sup> AAS, Curwen Family Papers, Box 3, folder 1

firearms carried by his men. Rushing back to the town, he ordered all casks brought ashore and immediately opened. The lead balls were turned out on the ground and the inhabitants began hammering them into slugs (reducing their diameter by flattening or elongating them). Later, when the enemy had finally been driven off, Church ordered a pursuit, but found that most of his men were out of usable ammunition, and in fact most had been forced to hammer their own slugs in the heat of battle.<sup>93</sup>

In 1704, after many years in provincial service, Church made some recommendations to the government on the handling and proper outfitting of soldiers in the field. Among the many suggestions, the old warrior wrote that each soldier should have a bag or "wallet" for shot "of such a size as will fit his gun [and] that every man's bag be so marked that he may not change it. For if so, it will make a great confusion in action." Each soldier should also try his powder and gun before action, and each company should have a reserve barrel of powder with an identification mark "that men may know beforehand, and may not be cheated out of their lives by having bad powder, or not knowing how to use it."<sup>94</sup> It is unknown if Church's recommendations were adopted, although from the continued problems experienced by provincial

---

<sup>93</sup> Thomas Church, The History of the Great Indian War of 1675 and 1676 Commonly called Philip's War, also, The Old French and Indian Wars, from 1689 to 1704 (Hartford, Conn, 1845 edition, orig. pub. 1716), 160-70.

<sup>94</sup> Church, The History of the Great Indian War, 245-9.

soldiers with munitions after 1704 it is doubtful, but he at least recognized the difficulties and tried to address them.

The problems of logistics in the early French wars are often ignored for the more glamorous and tangible expeditions and major raids. "It is the dramatic and momentous events at the sharp end of war that jostle for our attention," wrote John Keegan and Richard Holmes, " ... [but] it is no exaggeration to say that tactics - the art of winning battles - is really no more than the art of the logistically possible."<sup>95</sup> The New England colonies often had tactical and strategic plans impeded by the difficulties connected with the procurement of weapons and ammunition. Although the logistical support of armies in the eighteenth century was difficult at best, the protectionist or mercantile policies of Great Britain which denied the colonies an industrial base necessary for the support of warfare in the age of gunpowder handicapped New England in its military operations. Restricted in the production of iron and steel, and lacking sufficient powder mills and a domestic supply of lead and flints, Massachusetts and New Hampshire were forced to rely on the English for their war supplies, a reliance which would in turn promote closer ties with the government in London.

But the logistical nightmare did not end with the procurement of weapons and munitions. The inability of the

---

<sup>95</sup> Keegan and Holmes, Soldiers, 221.

New England colonies to standardize the weapons used by provincial soldiers multiplied the difficulties in the distribution of ammunition ten fold, and at the very least caused delays in operations while ammunition was sorted or recast, and at its very worst left soldiers hammering their musket balls while in the heat of battle. A solution to the problems of weapons procurement and the allocation of ammunition was beyond the capabilities of the colonial governments. They had neither the industrial base or the financial ability to issue uniform weapons to all their soldiers. Unlike his redcoated counterpart, the New England provincial soldier would have to contend with shortages of firearms and ammunition throughout the early French war period, and these unavoidable logistical handicaps often contributed to the military setbacks that blackened his reputation.

## **PART II**

### **THE PROVINCIAL SOLDIER**



## CHAPTER SEVEN

### GONE FOR A SOLDIER

As in almost all military systems throughout history, the provincial governments of Massachusetts and New Hampshire employed both a carrot and a stick in their efforts to find soldiers for active duty. They attempted to encourage or entice volunteers with wages and special incentives tied to the type of service involved, such as scalp money for scouting and plunder for expeditions. Underscored by a foundation of propaganda appealing to various tastes and inclinations, these "encouragements" did produce numerous volunteers, but not always in numbers needed to get the job done. The colonial governments prepared for such shortages by providing the legal means to press reluctant recruits for service. Thus by use of both the carrot (reward) and the stick (compulsion), the provincial governments found the soldiers to fight their wars.

Although varying in amount according to both time and place, almost all soldiers employed in "His Majesty's service" received wages.<sup>1</sup> The standard wage during the

---

<sup>1</sup> The only exception were the scalp hunters who received no regular wages, performing their service on speculation.

early French wars in both New Hampshire and Massachusetts graduated between forty shillings per month for privates to £7 per month for captains, to be paid from the time of "detachment" (from the militia, or civilian life) until an orderly discharge, including a "reasonable time allowed them to repair to their usual place of abode."<sup>2</sup> While this may be considered a standard, the provincial governments exhibited a great degree of flexibility in wages offered for services rendered. Soldiers performing short term service, such as patrols, and garrison duty in coastal forts, especially in peacetime, were paid considerably less. For example, soldiers stationed at the Castle in Boston harbor during King William's and Queen Anne's Wars received five shillings per week for their efforts, exactly half the normal pay.<sup>3</sup> In addition, soldiers performing long term

---

<sup>2</sup> Background of Selective Service (Washington, 1947), Vol II, Massachusetts Militia Laws, 160-2; Chandler E. Potter, The Military History of New Hampshire from its Founding until the Present Time (Report of the Adjutant-General of the State of New Hampshire for the Year ending June 1, 1866, Concord, NH, 1866), 40. Quote is from Massachusetts Levying Law of 1721. The devaluation and fluctuation of colonial currency during the French war period, especially its relative value to pounds sterling, is a subject too broad to go into detail in this study, beyond the immediate effects on the soldiers themselves. All references to currency in the text is colonial valuation, unless otherwise noted.

<sup>3</sup> James Phinney Baxter, ed., Documentary History of the State of Maine (Portland, ME, 1897), Collections of the Maine Historical Society, 2nd Series, Vol. V, 24-25; "Massachusetts Council in Assembly, May 28, 1703," Calendar of State Papers. Colonial Series. America and West Indies, December 1, 1702-1703 (Reprint of 1913 edition, Vaduz, 1964), Vol. 21, No. 760. See also "Journal of the House, April 13, 1745," Nathaniel Bouton, ed., Documents and Records Relating to the

duty often were paid a month's wages in advance, but scouting parties had to wait until the completion of their task.<sup>4</sup>

The captain, or officer commanding the individual companies, received the money and had to provide a receipt to the government. He in turn paid the men.<sup>5</sup> Officers of scouts submitted their journals and accounts to the Assemblies, generally in person, received the money and returned to distribute it. Occasionally deductions were made, such as the four pence per week for the use of a provincial weapon,<sup>6</sup> but the practise never approached the level of the English army, where the meager pay of the redcoats was consumed by deductions. Of the eight pence

---

Province of New Hampshire from 1738-1749 (Nashua, NH, 1871), New Hampshire Provincial and State Papers, Vol. V, 314.

<sup>4</sup> "Gov. Shirley's Communication, Jan. 25, 1745," Bouton, ed., NHSP, Vol. V, 266; Massachusetts Militia Laws, Background of Selective Service, 160.

<sup>5</sup> "Minutes of New Hampshire Council in Assembly, October 1, 1703," Calendar of State Papers, Vol. 21, No. 1114.

<sup>6</sup> Massachusetts Militia Laws, Background of Selective Service, 146, 162, 174. The deduction for the use of firearms was reduced to three pence in 1721, but by 1745 was increased to the earlier four pence. Other equipment, initially supplied by the soldier but needed to replace due to wear or damage, was provided by the government and the cost deducted from the soldiers pay. For example, at the commencement of Queen Anne's War the Massachusetts Council ordered their Commissary General, Andrew Belcher, to provide "hatchets, powder-hornes, belts and snapsacks of each 500, large shoes and stockens of each pair, and that they be lodged with the Commissary's at the several stores to be delivered to the souldiers as they shall have occasion to be charged therewith upon accompt." See "Minutes of Massachusetts Council, August 19, 1703," Calendar of State Papers, Vol. 21, No. 1039.

sterling paid to British soldiers, two were subtracted as "off-reckonings", and basically went to pay for his clothing and to profit the colonel of the regiment. The rest, known as "subsistence", paid for his provisions and other necessities. Any money left over could be pocketed by the soldier.<sup>7</sup> Colonial soldiers rarely, if ever, paid for their provisions. During the summer of 1709, provincial soldiers waiting in vain for British support to attack Quebec had eight pence per day "punctually payd him for his victuals" over and above the nine shillings per week provided as wages.<sup>8</sup> Similarly, soldiers involved in the aborted Montreal campaign of 1747 were paid off at a rate of six pence sterling per day "clear of stoppages for provisions or billeting money."<sup>9</sup>

Unfortunately, provincial governments were not always able to pay their soldiers "punctually". Payment for scouting duty depended on how quickly the officer in command could get his accounts together and present them to the Assembly, and then how expeditiously that body could accept

---

<sup>7</sup> H. C. B. Rogers, The British Army of the Eighteenth Century (New York, 1977), 46.

<sup>8</sup> "Samuel Vetch to Earl of Sunderland, August 2, 12, 1709," Calendar of State Papers, Colonial Series, America and West Indies, June, 1708-1709 (Reprint of 1922 edition, Vaduz, 1964), Vol. 24, No. 666.

<sup>9</sup> "Shirley to Wentworth, November, 24, 1747," Isaac Hammond, ed., Miscellaneous Provincial and State Papers (Manchester, NH, 1890) New Hampshire Provincial and State Papers, Vol XVIII, 320.

the accounts and supply the funds.<sup>10</sup> Soldiers stationed in frontier forts or involved in expeditions also experienced delays in receiving their pay. One of the reasons for the mutinous behavior of the provincial soldiers at Louisbourg in the summer of 1745 was "their not being paid any part of their wages due."<sup>11</sup> Even soldiers posted nearer to home were not always paid promptly, such as those garrisoning Fort William and Mary during Queen Anne's War, "which is very intolerable to the poorer sort, to do service and not be payed, while the family starves at home."<sup>12</sup>

Bureaucratic red tape was often the root cause of the delay. War was an extraordinary circumstance demanding only temporary solutions. *Ad Hoc* committees of war were quickly established at the commencement of hostilities, and dismissed just as quickly at their conclusion, and therefore no standard procedures existed to handle the logistical and financial support of military forces. In addition, the colonial assemblies rarely surrendered their tight hold on the purse strings, even to an *ad hoc* committee of their own

---

<sup>10</sup> "Letter of Jeremiah Moulton, 1724," William Blake Trask, Letters of Colonel Thomas Westbrook and others Relative to Indian Affairs in Maine, 1722-1726 (Boston, 1901), 56.

<sup>11</sup> "Pepperrell Papers," Collections of the Massachusetts Historical Society, 6th Ser., Vol. X (1899), 45.

<sup>12</sup> "George Vaughn to Council of Trade and Plantation, July 6, 1708." Calendar of State Papers, Vol. 24, No. 19.

members, therefore all final payments had to be approved by the assemblies. The result was chaos and delays.<sup>13</sup>

The governments of Massachusetts and New Hampshire were also dilatory in their payments to soldiers simply because they did not have the money. It is well known that colonial governments experienced cash flow problems as the mercantile system drained the hard currency out of the New World and into the coffers of the mother country. The solution developed in New England involved the issuance of bills of credit based on future tax revenue, a solution developed after the financially disastrous Quebec expedition of 1690. One of the principal debts resulting from that expedition were the wages owed the participating soldiers.<sup>14</sup> The Bay government, confidently expecting victory to provide the wages for their soldiers, had not planned for defeat. Therefore, the promised rewards were written on a piece of paper and distributed to the disgruntled men. "We are stopping the mouths of the soldiers with a new mint of paper money," wrote Boston merchant Francis Brinley, "Not many will take it and those that will scarce know what to do with

---

<sup>13</sup> The best example of this situation was the absurd practice of requiring commanders of scouts, no matter how short in duration or few in number, to leave the frontier and report directly, in person, to the provincial assembly.

<sup>14</sup> Gary B. Nash, The Urban Crucible: The Northern Seaports and the Origins of the American Revolution (Abridged Edition, Cambridge, MA 1986), 36-37.

it."<sup>15</sup> Despite the depreciation of the currency during the remainder of the early French wars, the provincial soldiers got over their initial repugnance toward the bills of credit. It was, after all, the only money they were going to receive.<sup>16</sup>

In addition to the promptness of their wages, New England soldiers carefully monitored their rate of pay compared to the soldiers from other colonies, and loudly complained if they found themselves on the short end.<sup>17</sup> Massachusetts and New Hampshire soldiers who enlisted for Louisbourg were allowed twenty-five shillings per month for pay, far below the usual forty shillings, but they also were "entitled to all the plunder."<sup>18</sup> However, when denied the plunder "to which they were entitled by his Excellency's proclamation" after the fall of the fortress, the Massachusetts and New Hampshire soldiers looked askance at their "very low pay", especially when compared to the forty

---

<sup>15</sup> Quoted in William Pencak, War, Politics and Revolution in Provincial Massachusetts (Boston, 1981), 17.

<sup>16</sup> Lieutenant John Burk noted in his journal kept during his stay at the fort at Number Four in 1747 that the "Captain paid the Listed men and gave notes for the money." See "Journal of Lieutenant John Burk," Stevens Family Papers, Special Collections, University of Vermont, Entry for March 21.

<sup>17</sup> New England soldiers were never jealous of British red-coats. Although the New England currency was worth less than the sterling paid to English soldiers, the lack of deductions actually put the provincials far ahead.

<sup>18</sup> "Gov. Shirley's Communication, Jan. 25, 1745," Bouton, ed., NHSP, Vol. V, 266.

shillings given to Connecticut troops and the fifty shillings going to Rhode Island volunteers. By the fall of 1745, the governments of northern New England had to increase their soldiers' pay to the more usual forty shillings per month if they expected any to garrison the French fort over the winter.<sup>19</sup>

Such vigilance over their wages is understandable considering that the pay of provincial soldiers, even at the normal forty shillings per month, hovered near the bottom of the colonial wage scale. Gary Nash found soldiers' pay in New England to be below that of laborers and common seamen, and far below that of artisans in Boston who averaged five shillings per day when fully employed.<sup>20</sup> Therefore, as an incentive, the wages offered provincial soldiers by themselves attracted only the unemployed and disadvantaged.

Provincial governments could also appeal to their citizen's hearts, minds and souls in calling them to military service. By promoting war as both a patriotic obligation and a religious crusade, or reminding them of their responsibility to protect their communities and families from the savage horde, colonial leaders hoped to enlist volunteers who could ignore the meager pay and serve out of a sense of duty. In newspapers, proclamations and from the

---

<sup>19</sup> "Pepperrell Papers," Colls. Mass. Hist. Soc., Series VI, Vol. X, 45.

<sup>20</sup> Nash, Urban Crucible, 35-38. Artisan work was not steady, fluctuating according to demand and season, but their average yearly wage of £40 was far above the soldier's at £24.



pulpit New England men were exhorted to strike back at the enemy to stop the death and destruction on the frontier, and the devastation of fishing and trade on the sea.<sup>21</sup>

In his sermon, published in 1700, Good Souldiers a Great Blessing, Benjamin Wadsworth identified the just causes for war as defense or self-preservation, the recovery of great damages, and the revenging of injuries, all of which naturally struck at the heart of the New England experience of war. "Would you have your Country spoiled," he asked, "your Houses rifled and burnt, your Goods and Riches taken away, your Children dashed against the stones, your Wives and Daughters ravished before your faces, your Women with Child ript open, your Aged Fathers and Mothers barbarously dragged about the Streets, your Churches overthrown?" Such appeals could and did move men to enlist.<sup>22</sup>

Other men, especially those living on the frontier line, needed no reminders or exhortation to call them to duty. In 1689, Benjamin Church found the people of Casco (Falmouth), Maine eager to support any military action against the French and Indian enemy, and "willing to venture their lives and fortunes, in the said enterprise, wherein

---

<sup>21</sup> See Ronald F. Reid, "New England Rhetoric and the French War, 1754-1760: A Case Study in the Rhetoric of War," Communications Monographs, Vol. 43, no. 4 (Nov., 1976), 259-86, for a study of war propaganda during the last French war.

<sup>22</sup> Benjamin Wadsworth, Good Soldiers a Great Blessing (Boston, 1700), 6, 22.

they might serve God, their King, and country, and enjoy quiet and peaceable habitation."<sup>23</sup> Similar sentiments would inspire many on the frontier to participate in patrols and raids, as well as enlist in expeditions. For men such as Johnson Harmon, Jeremiah Moulton and John Goffe, participation in military endeavors was not in search of wealth from the meager wages, but in search of peace and safety for their families, communities and province. For some, military service became an exciting change from everyday existence, leading to repeated enlistment. Johnson Harmon, joint commander and hero of the attack on Norridgewock in 1724, was still volunteering for service in 1745. When asking William Pepperrell for some position on the Louisbourg expedition, the old soldier wrote, "I am persuaded their [sic] is something yet for me to do their [sic] before I leave the world."<sup>24</sup>

The provincial governments needed encouragements beyond poor wages and appeals to the conscience and emotion to attract volunteers, so they introduced special incentives which varied according to the type of service. Garrisoning the frontier forts was the least attractive military duty, especially in peacetime, because besides the interminable

---

<sup>23</sup> Thomas Church, The History of the Great Indian War of 1675 and 1676 Commonly called Philip's War, also, The Old French and Indian Wars, from 1689 to 1704 (Hartford, Conn, 1845 edition, orig. pub. 1716), 174.

<sup>24</sup> Charles Edward Banks, History of York, Maine (Boston, 1931-35), Vol. I, 335. See Chapter Nine for more information on propaganda and the effect on fighting spirit.

boredom, it usually paid less than normal service.<sup>25</sup> But under some circumstances there existed a possibility that the soldier could carve out a new home in the community surrounding his post, or at least "moonlight" at odd jobs for extra money. To encourage enlistment for the garrison of the new Fort George at Brunswick, Maine, the Pejepscot Proprietors offered the usual wages and subsistence, but indicated that the "Military Service expected from them at present [1715] is like to be so small as to permit them, besides their Wages, to earn money by Labour." The Proprietors promised to pay them as laborers to finish the fort at two shillings per day, and after to find them work in the community spitting staves, shingles or clapboards. After six months they could settle in the community with a grant of one hundred acres, having first obtained a suitable replacement.<sup>26</sup> Such opportunities were rare, however, and on the whole garrison duty, whether in a fortified house on the frontier or in a provincial fort, was a boring, thankless job, and usually given to the least desirable soldiers, the pressed and hired men who served with the greatest reluctance.<sup>27</sup>

---

<sup>25</sup> See above.

<sup>26</sup> James Phinney Baxter, ed., Documentary History of the State of Maine (Portland, ME, 1916), Collections of the Maine Historical Society, 2nd Series, Vol. XXIII, 251-2.

<sup>27</sup> See Chapters Two and Three.

The principal incentive for scouting was scalp money, and here presented the opportunity to make some real profit. During King William's War small cash awards had been offered for all adult Indian males, dead or alive. The volunteers from Newbury who pursued the Indians that had attacked the town of Dover in 1689 were offered £8 for every fighting man taken or killed, and the following year £12 were offered, "in leiu of Wages", for every Indian male captured or killed.<sup>28</sup> Rates fluctuated throughout that war as the government set rewards for specific missions and withdrew them afterward.

But early in Queen Anne's War, the Bay government set a standard policy and offered substantial rewards for the scalps of adult male Indians, with the greatest amount awarded to those who served without regular pay.<sup>29</sup> Those volunteers "maintain themselves free from the Province charge" would receive £40, volunteers in service £20, regular forces (pressed men) £10, and pursuit forces £30.<sup>30</sup>

---

<sup>28</sup> James Phinney Baxter, ed., Documentary History of the State of Maine (Portland, ME, 1907), Collections of the Maine Historical Society, 2nd Series, Vol. IX, 2; Baxter, ed., Doc. Hist. Me., Vol. V, 158-9. Soldiers were allowed return from any women and children captured, as well as goods or plunder.

<sup>29</sup> See Chapter Four for more on these scalp hunters.

<sup>30</sup> Samuel Penhallow, The History of the Wars of New England with the Eastern Indians (Boston, 1726; Facsimile Reprint, Annotated by Edward Wheelock, Williamstown, MA, 1973), 39. The figures are Penhallow, other sources indicate the initial reward was £40 for volunteers without pay, £32 for those with pay. See "Minutes of Massachusetts Council, December 2, 1703," Calendar of State Papers, Vol. 21, No. 1344.

Within a few years the reward for volunteers without wages from the province was increased to £100 (£60 for those with pay), and would remain at that level at least through the end of Dummer's War.<sup>31</sup> The rewards were quite impressive when compared to a Boston artisan's annual income of £40, or the salary of Increase Mather as President of Harvard at £50.<sup>32</sup> They did prove quite popular among the more adventurous sort, who balanced the risk, commitment of time, and no guarantees with the possible return, and considered the gamble worthwhile.<sup>33</sup>

---

<sup>31</sup> "Governor Joseph Dudley to Council of Trade and Plantations, April 20, 1704," Calendar of State Papers, Colonial Series, America and West Indies, 1704-1705 (Reprint of 1916 edition, Vaduz, 1964), Vol. 22, No. 260; "Governor Joseph Dudley to Council of Trade and Plantations, March 1, 1709," Calendar of State Papers, Vol. 24, No. 391; Penhallow, The History of the Wars of New England, 94; James Phinney Baxter, ed., Documentary History of the State of Maine (Portland, ME, 1907), Collections of the Maine Historical Society, 2nd Series, Vol. X, 280.

<sup>32</sup> The first figure is from Nash, Urban Crucible, 46. The second is quoted in Pencak, War, Politics and Revolution, 37.

<sup>33</sup> On Lovewell's second raid he and his men killed ten Indians, at £100 each, plus sold most of the captured weapons for £7 a piece. Other plunder included blankets, moccasins and a few furs. Penhallow, The History of the Wars of New England, 110. See also Journals of the Rev. Thomas Smith and the Rev. Samuel Deane (Portland, ME, 1849), 120-21.

The enthusiasm for this development has not been shared by everyone. Nineteenth century historian Samuel Adams Drake felt the introduction of scalp bounties brought "into the conflict the new, and to this later generation repugnant, incentive of private gain. This was treating the Indians and wolves alike. It was even more; for thus to authorize the forming of scalping parties was to put them on a level with the savages themselves." See Samuel Adams Drake, The Border Wars of New England. Commonly called King

In raising soldiers for expeditions, the governments of Massachusetts and New Hampshire, as well as London, became most inventive and generous, although the generosity often proved to be illusory. For their participation in major expeditions, the men of New England were offered three kinds of incentives. The first category included bounties and gifts of equipment. Although the provincial governments could not hope to match the munificence of British authorities, they did contribute whatever they could. For the Port Royal expedition of 1707 the soldiers were given coats of a uniform color, creating a "red" regiment and a "blue" regiment to "add life to the service."<sup>34</sup> The provincial government repeated the contribution of red and blue coats for the Quebec expedition of 1709 and the Port Royal assault the following year. In 1709 they also paid the volunteers a bounty of £12.<sup>35</sup>

---

William's and Queen Anne's Wars (1897, reprint of 1910 edition, Williamstown, MA, 1973), 166. Drake's indignation, of course, is a classic example of condemning the past with the beliefs of the present, but, after removing the moral judgement, what he says is essentially true. See Chapters Ten and Twelve for more on the perception of the Indian.

<sup>34</sup> Penhallow, The History of the Wars of New England, 42; "Captain John Redknap to Council of Trade and Plantations, February 20, 1708," Calendar of State Papers, Colonial Series, America and West Indies, 1706-1708 (Reprint of 1916 edition, Vaduz, 1964), Vol. 23, No. 1347.

<sup>35</sup> "Samuel Vetch to Earl of Sunderland, August 2, 12, 1709," Calendar of State Papers, Vol. 24, No. 666; "Enlistment Proclamation, 1710," Calendar of State Papers, Colonial Series, America and West Indies, 1710-June, 1711 (Reprint of 1924 edition, Vaduz, 1964), Vol. 25, No. 491 ix.

It was also during the aborted expedition of 1709 that the British government sent muskets and ammunition to be distributed to the soldiers as further incentive for enlistment.<sup>36</sup> In proposing the expedition, Samuel Vetch had requested the British arms to overcome the supply problems associated with the varying bore sizes of provincial weapons. The British government agreed with the wisdom of this and continued the contribution of weapons whenever possible.<sup>37</sup>

The firm commitment of British forces in the Quebec expedition of 1711 prompted the London government to go all out in providing "encouragements" for provincial recruits, so much so that the New England governments had to contribute very little that year. All soldiers were to receive, in addition to a musket, "a coat, breeches, stockings, shoes with buckles, two coloured shirts, coloured neckcloths, and hat, gratis." And for those soldiers who "distinguished themselves," land grants would be provided from the conquered territory.<sup>38</sup>

---

<sup>36</sup> Penhallow, The History of the Wars of New England, 50.

<sup>37</sup> "Explanatory Supplement to Vetch's Canada Proposal, November 17, 1708," Calendar of State Papers, Vol. 24, No. 196; Baxter, ed., Doc. Hist. Me., Vol. IX, 285. The British also provided weapons for the Port Royal expedition of 1710. See "Enlistment Proclamation, 1710," Calendar of State Papers, Vol. 25, No. 491 ix. For more information on firearms see Chapter Six.

<sup>38</sup> "Proclamation by Governor Joseph Dudley, June 12, 1711," Calendar of State Papers, Colonial Series, America and West Indies, July, 1711-June, 1712 (Reprint of 1925 edition, Vaduz, 1964), Vol. 26, No. 44 xb. Colonial governments had provided land grants for soldiers who

Of course, the territory was not conquered that year so no land grants were given, and the uniforms provided apparently left much to be desired. The clothing had been packaged in bundles and shipped over with the fleet, enough for both the land forces going to Quebec, and those attacking Montreal from Albany. When the expedition ended suddenly on the shoals of the St Lawrence river, the muskets were collected from the returning soldiers and added to the provincial stores.<sup>39</sup> Colonel Francis Nicholson was ordered to dispose of the uniforms as best he could. He sold some at auction and sent the rest to the garrison at Annapolis Royal.<sup>40</sup> Complaints from the garrison concerning these uniforms poured into Whitehall. They were "the worst that ever was seen in these parts ... unfit for so cold a climate, being only a sort of frock without any lining and no waistcoats ... [and] are extreemly damaged and withall so

---

fought in King Philip's War (the Narraganset settlements, like Gorham, Maine, see Hugh D. McLellan, History of Gorham, Maine (Portland, ME, 1903), 32), but shied away from that solution as their unsettled lands became tied up in disputed claims. The British government, on the other hand, was very generous in parceling out conquered land to its soldiers, with the proviso that it first had to be conquered. See "T. Harley to Council of Trade and Plantations, August 11, 1713," Calendar of State Papers, Colonial Series, America and West Indies, July, 1712-July, 1714 (Reprint of 1926 edition, Vaduz, 1964), Vol. 27, No. 448.

<sup>39</sup> "Governor Joseph Dudley to Council of Trade and Plantations, December 2, 1712," Calendar of State Papers, Vol. 27, No. 153.

<sup>40</sup> "Henry Norton to Council of Trade and Plantations, May 13, 1715," Calendar of State Papers, Colonial Series, America and West Indies, August, 1714-December, 1715 (Reprint of 1928 edition, Vaduz, 1964), Vol. 28, No. 408.



slight and thinn, etc., several of the men must perish, if care is not taken to send a compleat clothing fitt for so cold and uncomfortable a climate."<sup>41</sup>

In 1740 the British also supplied provincials enlisting for Cartagena weapons and uniforms, but perhaps remembering the previous experience, they sent examples of both for display purposes. They also gave the provincials tents and agreed to provide transport home after the expedition for those who desired. As most of the colonials who participated died during that disease infested siege, there were few complaints.<sup>42</sup> The provincial governments aided the

---

<sup>41</sup> The quotes come various reports, including Calendar of State Papers, Vol. 28, Nos. 173, 397, 411. The last complaint coming from "John Mulcaster, Agent and Paymaster to the Garrison and Four independent companies [of provincials]."; See also Nos. 413, 423.

The individual who supplied the uniforms expressed shock at the complaints. "[The] Sergeants surtout coates were made of the best Glocestershire cloaths," he wrote, "and 1396 of the centinell's coates, the rest of the centinells with whole thick kerseys, which are as dear as cloath, but allowed by everybody to wear much longer, and is what all the foreigners cloath withall. As to their not being lined H. M. saved largely thereby in what was given the militia." Here is illustrated the normal ignorance of Englishmen for conditions in the New World. Because the provincials were only "militia" they could suffer through a Canadian winter with the comforting, and perhaps warming, thought that they had saved the government some money by going without linings (and waistcoats for that matter). Concerning the damage, the uniform maker admitted that this may have happened when "the goods were tossed from vessell to vessell." See Calendar of State Papers, Vol. 26, No. 115.

<sup>42</sup> Hammond, ed., NHSP, Vol XVIII, 105-7; Douglas Edward Leach, "The Cartagena Expedition, 1740-1742, and Anglo-American Relations," in Maarten Ultee, ed., Adapting to Conditions: War and Society in the Eighteenth Century (University of Alabama, 1986), 46.

British in their recruiting by adding a few incentives of their own. For example, New Hampshire offered three months pay in advance, instead of the usual one, a £5 bounty and a "good new blanket."<sup>43</sup>

The recruiting incentives offered for Louisbourg were quite meager in comparison to the previous expeditions. Like Port Royal in 1707, Louisbourg was conceived and initiated by the provincial governments on their own, and so they could not draw on the British for equipment. Recruits for the great expedition were offered a £4 bounty, £1 for billeting money to get them to the various mustering areas, and a blanket.<sup>44</sup> Due to the great disappointments arising from Louisbourg, the governments of New England had to substantially increase their incentives to find recruits for the Canada expedition the following year - offering their highest bounty ever, £30, and, of course, a blanket.<sup>45</sup>

Exemption from any military press for three years constituted a second form of incentive offered by New England authorities, included in the encouragements for both the Port Royal expedition of 1710 and for Cartagena thirty years later.<sup>46</sup> But by far the most controversial form of incentive for expeditions was the promise of a share of any

---

<sup>43</sup> Hammond, ed., NHSP, Vol XVIII, 49.

<sup>44</sup> Bouton, ed., NHSP, Vol. V, 235, 266.

<sup>45</sup> Hammond, ed., NHSP, Vol XVIII, 243.

<sup>46</sup> "Enlistment Proclamation, 1710," Calendar of State Papers, Vol. 25, No. 491 ix; Hammond, ed., NHSP, Vol XVIII, 108.

plunder captured from the enemy - a promise which had little reality, but may have been the most influential encouragement of all.

From the very beginning of the French wars, the provincial governments dangled the lure of plunder and booty before their potential recruits. Soldiers accompanying Sir William Phips to Port Royal in 1690 were told that "If the French shall not surrender Upon the Articles Offered them; but shall necessitate our Forces to Expose themselves in the Assault ... Then besides their stated Pay, the just Half of all Plunder taken from the Enemy shall be shared among the Officers and Souldiers."<sup>47</sup> This offer is quite restrained and specific, following the European custom that fortresses or towns taken by assault could be plundered by the soldiers. Port Royal did surrender to Phips and he and his army proceeded to remove everything that was not nailed down, leaving the empty shell to be reoccupied by the French at their leisure. However, though the soldiers shared in the plunder, they had not taken the fort by assault as stipulated in the recruiting proclamation. The French commander had recognized the inevitable and capitulated after a token defense. Phips' plundering of the fort was seen by many as a violation of the surrender agreement,

---

<sup>47</sup> Baxter, ed., Doc. Hist. Me., Vol. V, 60-61.

including the French commander who sued Phips for his personal belongings.<sup>48</sup>

But Phips had proved that victory was possible and plunder a reality, which explains the anticipation for the attack on Quebec that fall, and the bitter disappointment experienced when they failed, especially by government leaders who expected to pay their soldiers with the riches of New France. Despite this setback, the prospect of plunder would be offered to all future volunteers, but without the qualifications expressed in 1690. Soldiers sailing for Quebec in 1711 were simply promised that the plunder would be "apportioned the same, justly and equally,"<sup>49</sup> and those volunteering for the British expedition against Cartagena "shall .. have their just share and proportion of all plunder or Booty."<sup>50</sup>

With the exception of Port Royal in 1690, none of the colonial expeditions before 1745 produced plunder because all but one failed. Only at Port Royal in 1710 did they manage to capture the French stronghold, but as the colonial and British leaders decided to keep the fort this time, the soldiers were not allowed to strip it. Despite this poor

---

<sup>48</sup> Francis Parkman also condemned Phips for his actions. He believed the plundering of the fort did "him no credit," and that he actually "displayed a scandalous rapacity." See Francis Parkman, Count Frontenac and New France under Louis XIV (Boston, 1896), 239.

<sup>49</sup> "Proclamation by Governor Joseph Dudley, June 12, 1711," Calendar of State Papers, Vol. 26, No. 44 xb.

<sup>50</sup> Hammond, ed., NHSP, Vol XVIII, 105.

return, prospects for plunder at Louisbourg seemed plausible to many. Louisbourg was not a small, isolated fort, but a rich port city, and the recruiting proclamations had been blunt and to the point concerning any spoils - the volunteers shall be "entitled to all the plunder."<sup>51</sup> It was the very real prospects for plunder which encouraged Massachusetts and New Hampshire soldiers to initially accept less than normal wages.

However, when the fortress fell, the terms of the surrender protected the property of the residents and thus denied plunder to the provincial soldiers. The disappointment was deep and profound. There was "a great Noys and hubbub a mungst the Soldiers a bout the Plonder," reported one soldier,<sup>52</sup> and William Pepperrell wrote to Governor William Shirley about the "spirit of discontent" because the soldiers "have been disappointed of the chief part of the plunder to which they were entitled by his Excellency's proclamations."<sup>53</sup> Adding to the discontent was the fact that Peter Warren's British squadron daily snatched fat French ships who in ignorance sailed toward the captured port. According to custom, all sailors shared prize money from captured ships, but the land forces received nothing. "Could I persuade myself the land forces would have a share

---

<sup>51</sup> Buton, ed., NHSP, Vol. V, 266.

<sup>52</sup> Louis E. De Forest, Louisbourg Journals: 1745 (New York, 1932), 92.

<sup>53</sup> "Pepperrell Papers," Colls. Mass. Hist. Soc., 6th Ser., Vol. X, 45.

in the immense riches that have fallen into [our] hands," wrote one soldier, "I think some considerable part is due to them in Equity but am much afraid they will never receive any."<sup>54</sup>

He was right, of course, and the attraction of plunder as a recruiting incentive evaporated, which is why the governments of Massachusetts and New Hampshire had to offer such a high bounty the following year to raise troops for an attack on Quebec. As the Reverend Thomas Smith of Falmouth, Maine reported in his journal, "[Recruiting for] the expedition to Canada goes on in this Province, but slowly; our people being dispirited on account of the sickness and their unfair treatment at Cape Breton."<sup>55</sup>

Disillusionment and resistance to military service was not uncommon in the early French wars. Similar to the aftermath of Louisbourg, the disappointment of the aborted 1709 Quebec expedition created difficulties for those recruiting for the Port Royal campaign the following summer,<sup>56</sup> and the New England authorities often had trouble finding sufficient men to garrison their forts and serve on the exposed frontier. Despite all the incentives offered and all the propaganda underscoring the necessity and

---

<sup>54</sup> "Curwen to W.G., 1745," in American Antiquarian Society, Curwen Family Papers, Box 3, Folder 1.

<sup>55</sup> Journals of the Rev. Thomas Smith and the Rev. Samuel Deane, 124, entry for June 20, 1746.

<sup>56</sup> "Francis Nicholson and Samuel Vetch to Council of Trade and Plantations, September 16, 1710," Calendar of State Papers, Vol. 25, No. 396.

responsibility to defend the provinces and attack the enemy, the provincial governments still could not produce enough volunteers for their military requirements, and thus they had to press or draft soldiers to fill their quotas.<sup>57</sup>

Although a "method to be made use of in cases of great necessity only,"<sup>58</sup> the press was used quite frequently throughout the early French wars to flesh out provincial companies, especially those bound for service on the frontier where the government had to defend the garrison houses and forts, maintain patrols, and dispatch raiding parties. "For the more speedy levying of souldiers for their majesties service," the governments of Massachusetts and New Hampshire passed numerous acts for "Levying Souldiers" during the French wars which provided the legal right to force men into military service.<sup>59</sup> When it became necessary to press soldiers, the government would employ the administrative branch of its military system to perform that duty - the local militia.

---

<sup>57</sup> Parkman, Count Frontenac, 245. For example, in preparation for Phips' assault on Port Royal in 1690, the Bay government issued the following order. "If upon the Encouragement given men do not readily and voluntarily offer themselves in the present Expedition ... [the members of the Committee of War] are Impowred to give forth their Orders to Impress men for that Service so many as shalbe necessary." - Baxter, ed., Doc. Hist. Me., Vol. V, 62.

<sup>58</sup> Quoted in Pencak, War, Politics and Revolution, 123.

<sup>59</sup> Massachusetts Militia Laws, Background of Selective Service, 144. Quote is from the act passed in 1693-4, thus the reference to "their majesties".

In Arms for Empire: A Military History of the British Colonies in North America, 1607-1763, Douglas Leach provided an excellent description of the procedures used in pressing soldiers. When raising troops for the frontier, or even expeditions, towns often had quotas assigned, and were expected to maintain that number by furnishing replacements whenever necessary. Following the record book of a captain of militia from Salisbury, Massachusetts, Leach found that the local militia officers would assemble their men, call for volunteers to fill the town's quota, then, when the number of volunteers proved inadequate, impress the balance.<sup>60</sup>

For those who declined to serve when pressed, there were two options, one of which was legal. The Levying Acts provided exemption through the payment of a fine within a limited time. In 1693 a £5 fine paid within two hours of being pressed bought exemption, and there was no dishonor attached to this procedure as "all persons so paying the said fine of five pounds shall be esteemed to have served."<sup>61</sup> The fine was increased to £10 in 1699 and stayed at that level through 1748, with time limit eventually expanded to

---

<sup>60</sup> Douglas Leach, Arms for Empire: A Military History of the British Colonies in North America, 1607-1763 (New York, 1973), 22-23.

<sup>61</sup> Massachusetts Militia Laws, Background of Selective Service, See laws for the year 1693-4, 144-5.



twenty-four hours in 1746.<sup>62</sup> The fine enabled militia officers to hire someone to serve in the pressed man's place.

Militia officers could be quite inventive in pressing individuals, and used their knowledge of local conditions and inhabitants to advantage. For example, the captain of the Salisbury company pressed three men when one was needed, and the three pooled their resources to hire a substitute, thus filling the town's quota.<sup>63</sup> However, militia officers who refused to press were subject to penalties themselves, and any who accepted a bribe to keep someone from the press could be fined up to ten times the original bribe.<sup>64</sup>

This system of fines and substitutes resulted in three recognized levels of provincial soldier: the volunteer, pressed men, and hired soldiers. In the opinion of government officials and many officers, the hired soldier came definitely last on the list. Not only had they refused to volunteer, but they were also less than desirable in the eyes of their town officers. Having just witnessed the desertion of some provincial soldiers in 1689, Sylvanus Davis, commander at Falmouth, Maine, expressed the opinion that the practice of hiring soldiers would be the ruin of

---

<sup>62</sup> Massachusetts Militia Laws, Background of Selective Service, See Laws for Levying Souldiers in 1699 (150), 1702 (158), 1721 (161-2), 1746 (176).

<sup>63</sup> Leach, Arms for Empire, 23.

<sup>64</sup> Massachusetts Militia Laws, Background of Selective Service, See laws for 1699, 150.

the country.<sup>65</sup> When Timothy Dwight was ordered to reduce his garrison at Fort Dummer at the conclusion of Dummer's War in 1725, he was instructed to "act without the least Partiality [in deciding who would stay] Having a regard to length of time they have been in the service, if their Volunteers or pressed (not hired) men."<sup>66</sup>

The second method of refusing a press was simply to hide or run away. During the Glorious Revolution men pressed for service did not report because "the Government [was] not Settled,"<sup>67</sup> but with the "settlement" of a new government and the passage of new acts, the failure to report after being pressed resulted in three months imprisonment.<sup>68</sup> Occasionally, men who refused the press were victims of economic or personal problems. Despite the inventiveness and sympathy of local militia officers, not everyone could produce £5 or £10 with two hour's notice. During Dummer's War, two men pressed for service on the frontier neither paid their fine nor reported at the rendezvous. "One of them no body pities or is concerned

---

<sup>65</sup> Baxter, ed., Doc. Hist. Me., Vol. IX, 42.

<sup>66</sup> "Lt-Governor Dummer to Timothy Dwight at Fort Dummer, Dec. 28, 1725," Massachusetts Historical Society, Miscellaneous Bound.

<sup>67</sup> Baxter, ed., Doc. Hist. Me., Vol. V, 5.

<sup>68</sup> Massachusetts Militia Laws, Background of Selective Service, See laws for 1693-4, 144-5. The sentence was increased to six months in 1699.

for," but the other was considered by his fellow soldiers as a victim of circumstances.<sup>69</sup>

However, the provincial governments cared not if individuals were to be pitied or censured, contempt for the press resulted in unfilled quotas and handicapped the war effort. New England authorities found that as King William's War progressed, the number of men escaping from the press increased, most of them fleeing south to other colonies. The Bay government expressed the problem succinctly in 1702 in the preamble of "An Act in Addition to the Act for Levying Souldiers":

"Whereas it has been found by often experience, that when warrants have been issued for the detaching or impressing of souldiers for the defence of the country, the ablest and fittest for service have absconded and hid themselves from the impress, by means whereof the officers have been necessitated to send persons less capeable, to the great dishonour and disadvantage of the service, and discouragement of the officers appointed to conduct and lead them forth."

To remedy the situation the officers of all militia companies were ordered to keep a list of their most able men, up to one quarter of their company, who would be ready at a moment's notice to go into service. Any detachment or

---

<sup>69</sup> Trask, Letters of Colonel Thomas Westbrook, 69.

press could "speedily be supplied out of the men so enlisted."<sup>70</sup> Although in the summer of 1703, Governor Joseph Dudley would report to London that he had dispatched "200 men of the best quarter part of the Militia [to the frontier], who have been ten months detached by vertue of an Act of the Assembly,"<sup>71</sup> this legislation would not stop the flow of "draft dodgers" out of the province. By April, 1704, Dudley would be complaining that the "young fellows the fittest for service" were running to Rhode Island and he could not get them back.<sup>72</sup> The only other solution seemed to be to stiffen the penalties for avoiding the press, especially for those who left the province. By 1746 those caught leaving Massachusetts to escape military service could be sentenced to twelve months in prison and a fine of £20.<sup>73</sup> However, this solution was no cure, and the problem of men not "attending" the press would remain throughout the French war period.<sup>74</sup>

---

<sup>70</sup> Massachusetts Militia Laws, Background of Selective Service, 158. This would be an augmentation of the alarm list system. See Chapter One.

<sup>71</sup> "Governor Joseph Dudley to Council of Trade and Plantations, August 5, 1703," Calendar of State Papers, Vol. 21, No. 996.

<sup>72</sup> "Governor Joseph Dudley to Council of Trade and Plantations," Baxter, ed., Doc. Hist. Me., Vol. IX, 180-2.

<sup>73</sup> Massachusetts Militia Laws, Background of Selective Service, See laws for 1746, 176.

<sup>74</sup> To support the prevalent argument, as expressed by James Kirby Martin and Mark Edward Lender, that provincial soldiers were "not militia, but rather out casts from middle class society, unfortunates who had been lured

In addition to quotas assigned to the militia, provincial officers recruited directly to fill their companies. First, the government laid a foundation of propaganda, usually in the form of proclamations outlining the purpose of the service and the rewards or incentives available to volunteers, which were posted in public buildings throughout the colony.<sup>75</sup> Then the officer chosen by the committees of war or the overall commander, and approved by the government, were "authorized and empowered" to "beat his drum within the Regiments of Militia", or to

---

or legally pressed into service," historians have placed considerable emphasis on the numerous statutes allowing for the pressing of soldiers. Lawrence Delbert Cress wrote that the exemption fee freeing pressed men from duty "allowed propertied persons to avoid service with little difficulty and left the burden of military service on those unable to purchase exemptions." However, throughout all the French wars the bulk of provincial soldiers were free volunteers who enlisted under no compulsion from the government. Only a small proportion of soldier raised in northern New England were pressed or hired men, but while the proportion was small, perhaps ten to thirty percent of any given force, those men still had to be found in order to complete provincial companies. As in most bureaucratic systems, a great many laws and regulations were passed to find a relatively small number of men, and thus too much reliance on the levying acts has caused distortions. See James Kirby Martin and Mark Edward Lender, A Respectable Army: The Military Origins of the Republic, 1763-1789 (Arlington Heights, IL, 1982), 19, and Lawrence Delbert Cress, Citizens in Arms: The Army and the Militia in American Society to the War of 1812 (Chapel Hill, NC, 1982), 5.

<sup>75</sup> "Francis Nicholson and Samuel Vetch to Earl of Sunderland, June 28, 1709," Calendar of State Papers, Vol. 24, No. 604; "Enlistment Proclamation, 1710," Calendar of State Papers, Vol. 25, No. 491 ix; "Proclamation by Governor Joseph Dudley, June 12, 1711," Calendar of State Papers, Vol. 26, No. 44 xb. The printing these proclamation constituted another of the little charges that increased the cost of the war. See Bouton, ed., NHSP, Vol. V, 888.

"beat up for Volunteers throughout this Province" for "His Majesty's Service."<sup>76</sup>

In theory this referred to the actual beating of a drum in a public place, such as a town square, at a fair or market, in order to draw a crowd. In Europe a recruiting party traditionally consisted of a junior officer, a sergeant and a drummer. The drummer would attract the crowd, then the officer seated himself behind the drum while the sergeant gave a memorized, and hopefully inspiring, recruiting speech. The potential recruit, if any, would approach the officer and sign or make his mark using the drumhead as a desk. The officer would hand him his bounty and the sergeant would take charge of the new soldier.<sup>77</sup>

This was the origin and literal meaning of the beating order, but in reality the phrase "beat his drums" was synonymous with "recruit and enlist," and the recruiting officer proceeded by himself from town to town looking for men to fill his company. The easiest approach in this situation was to contact the local militia officers and have them assemble their men.<sup>78</sup> The provincial officers could then make a speech about duty, God and province. All officers of the militia and town officials were ordered by

---

<sup>76</sup> Quotes taken from AAS, Curwen Family Papers, Box 3, Folder 1; Hammond, ed., NHSP, Vol XVIII, 215;

<sup>77</sup> Rogers, The British Army, 58-80.

<sup>78</sup> In this instance, the drummers of the company, if available, would probably be used to assemble the men, thus providing literal meaning to the "beating order."

the government to offer no "Obstruction or Molestation herein, but on the Contrary to Afford him all the necessary encouragement and Assistance."<sup>79</sup> The remembrances of Benjamin Church provide the best example of this process:

Colonel Church no sooner received his commission, but proceeded to the raising of men, volunteers, by going into every town within the three counties, which were formerly Plymouth government; advising with the chief officer of each company, to call his company together, that so he might have the better opportunity to discourse and encourage them to serve their Queen and country. Treating them with drink convenient, told them [that] he did not doubt but with God's blessing to bring them all home again. All which with many other arguments, animated their hearts to do service. So, that Colonel Church enlisted, out of some companies, near twenty men, and others fifteen.<sup>80</sup>

---

<sup>79</sup> Hammond, ed., NHSP, Vol XVIII, 215; Historian John K. Mahon indicated that officers given beating orders were recruiting outside the militia system, as opposed to the quota system, and thus attracted the "lowest social stratum." (See John K. Mahon, History of the Militia and the National Guard (New York, 1983), 21.) But beating order specifically mentioned the regiments of militia, and provincial officers recruiting for active service utilized the administrative function of the militia, which was to keep track of eligible men. If those outside the militia system joined, it was because they were attracted by the drums of the assembly, had read or heard about the proclamations, and took the opportunity to join.

<sup>80</sup> Church, The History of the Great Indian War, 251.

Outside of the militia system, provincial officers could find men reduced to inactivity and availability by economic crisis or by the war itself.<sup>81</sup> When the frontier towns of Maine were abandoned during King William's War, communities along the North shore found "many of the Easterne men In towne prompt and Ready for the service."<sup>82</sup> At the beginning of Dummer's War, John Penhallow wrote to Governor Samuel Shute from the Maine frontier that "there are here several smart lusty young men that have been robbed of all they had by the Indians, who would be glad to be in the service if your Excellency would be pleased to admit of it, They cannot possibly subsist here without."<sup>83</sup> Similarly, two years later Colonel Thomas Westbrook informed the government that "I believe I can enlist the number of thirty men & more generally young men and such as must leave the county if not enlisted."<sup>84</sup>

If the provincial officer was popular and well-respected, like Church, he would have little difficulty enlisting soldiers, but if he was unknown, or the intended service suspect or unpopular, recruiting could be a discouraging process. Given "beating orders and articles of

---

<sup>81</sup> For more on recruits produced by economic crisis see Pencak, War, Politics and Revolution, 121; Nash, Urban Crucible, 35, 104-5.

<sup>82</sup> "Bartholomew Gedney of Salem to Bay government, Oct. 15, 1690," Baxter, ed., Doc. Hist. Me., Vol. V, 154-5.

<sup>83</sup> Baxter, ed., Doc. Hist. Me., Vol. X, 150.

<sup>84</sup> Baxter, ed., Doc. Hist. Me., Vol. X, 186-7.



encouragement for enlisting a company of volunteers" from New Hampshire for the Cartagena expedition of 1740, John Eyre reported that he "did beat up in the several towns in the province where there was any prospect of success, and made several journeys forth and back and was indefatigable therein the better to effect the proposed enlistment." Unfortunately, Eyre found no success in raising his company, but "was put to as great expence as if the design had been effected." In fact, he "spent seventy days viz. from August the 8th: to October:16th: and the sum of forty-five pounds fifteen shillings and nine pence to procure and encourage the enlistment of soldiers, for which, ... your petitioner [had] no compensation over and above the allowance granted to a common soldier."<sup>55</sup>

Even a successful officer found recruiting a time consuming and expensive occupation. To raise the forces necessary for his 1696 raid, Benjamin Church traveled twice throughout eastern Connecticut and Plymouth colony, "dureing which Time your Petitioner is well assured That he Spent in horse hire, Travelling the aforesaid journeys, passing Ferrys, upon Companyes, and in Necessary Treating of divers persons for an Accomodation in the premises, above Six and thirty pounds money, whereof he only received Twenty Seven pounds out of the Publick Treasury."<sup>56</sup>

---

<sup>55</sup> Hammond, ed., *NHSP*, Vol XVIII, 119. The government of New Hampshire granted Eyre £20 for his trouble.

<sup>56</sup> Baxter, ed., *Doc. Hist. Me.*, Vol. V, 479-81.

Provincial recruiting officers also had to contend with indecision and antipathy from potential recruits and even communities as a whole. As Thomas Westbrook discovered in 1724 when trying to find recruits in Maine, "one day they say they will Enlist, another they don't know."<sup>87</sup> Samuel Waldo, recruiting men for the Louisbourg, encountered considerable resistance in Falmouth, Maine. "I have given the utmost attention to the raising levys," he wrote to William Pepperrell, "which has met with some obstruction from persons who I had not suspected, nor would you I think. One a Justice of Peace near Stroudwater I am well asured has told some that if they went they would dye there, & be damned to, others who are concerned largely in the fishing trade imaging the Embargo will be taken off on the Departure of the fleet." Waldo found the Indian threat also discouraging others from enlisting, with the principal minister of the town against "drawing" men out of the town for that reason.<sup>88</sup>

Community, familial and economic responsibilities often clouded the personal decision to perform provincial service. The prospect of a an expedition or major reinforcement for the frontier produced discussions and meetings throughout northern New England, but particularly so in towns along the frontier. Gatherings were held at public houses or the

---

<sup>87</sup> Baxter, ed., Doc. Hist. Me., Vol. X.

<sup>88</sup> "John Osbourne to William Pepperrell, Feb. 18, 1744," Massachusetts Historical Society, Pepperrell Papers, Belknap Papers.

homes of prominent men for discussions concerning the merits and consequences of participation, discussions which often ran late into the night.<sup>88</sup>

Military service meant a reduction in manpower for a community, and lessened their ability to maintain their economy and even defend themselves. Writing to the Bay government in the summer of 1690, the Rev. John Emerson described the distress of Gloucester caused by the absence of men in provincial service. "There is forty seaven of our souldiers under a presse, the case so stands with us that if they be not released ... wee must all be forced to leave the towne ... We shall not have the men left to keepe up a watch, nor in any wise much lesse to withstand an enemy, which we are every day & night in expectation to breake in upon us, by reason that we are a front towne upon the sea ... besides, there will be nothing neare enough left to get in hay & harvest, so that wee must of necessity be forced to

---

<sup>88</sup> "Moses Butler to William Pepperrell, February 21, 1745," Mass. Hist. Soc., Pepperrell Papers, Belknap Papers. Butler had great difficulty raising a company for Louisbourg in Berwick, Maine, and complained that "Mr Ichabod Goodwin the last night had with him a considerable number of Enlisted men at his house and ther greeted them and Discouraged them from going in this Expedition." On a more positive note, Dr. Alexander Bulman reported to Pepperrell that in York, Captain Sewell had "called his men to his own house and generously entertained them all with a dinner and much encouraged them to engage in the present expedition." See Banks, History of York, Maine, Vol. I, 333-4.

kill our cattall, and [are] in great danger of being famished."<sup>00</sup>

Such considerations could produce a "backwardness in some of [the] men to leave their towns," and even an outright refusal to serve.<sup>01</sup> In March, 1725, the town of Lancaster, Massachusetts, which had been rotating men on patrol and garrison duty was suddenly ordered to have "all the scout and standing soldiers to appear ... with 50 days provisions at Dunstable." The men of the town "utterly refused to go."<sup>02</sup> In their petition to the governor, town leaders explained that "the men that are sent for from among us, are most of them inhabitants, employed in scouting, those that are inhabitants are frequently changed by leave from your honour, so that some that are employed are heads of familys." They pointed out that the town would be weakened and exposed if men were removed, and some had just returned home. "If all the men that are sent for, must go," they concluded, "the familys there will be in a manner

---

<sup>00</sup> Rev. John Emerson to Wait Winthrop, July 26, 1690," Collections of the Massachusetts Historical Society, Series V, Vol. I, 437-8; see also Baxter, ed., Doc. Hist. Me., Vol. V, 260-1 and "Letter dated November 25, 1691," AAS, Curwen Family Papers, Box 3, Folder 1.

<sup>01</sup> "John Osbourne to William Pepperrell, Feb. 18, 1744," Mass. Hist. Soc., Pepperrell Papers, Belknap Papers.

<sup>02</sup> "Edward Hartwell to Lt-Governor William Dummer, March 18 1725," AAS, Mass. Coll. 1629-1869, Box 3, Folder 11, Militia returns, Officers commissions and Misc. Papers 1696-1762.

wholly destitute of men."<sup>93</sup> Two months later Colonel Eleazer Tyng marched north with a quickly assembled force when he learned of Lovewell's disastrous fight with the Pequawket Indians. However, the men he raised refused to proceed until Tyng had written the governor to defend their towns because their departure had left the communities "very destitute and naked."<sup>94</sup>

For men with families, the decision to perform active duty often went beyond economic support and defense, but hinged on very personal considerations as well. All provincial soldiers with wives and families felt as William Pepperrell did when he wrote to his wife from Louisbourg that "although it is the earnest desire of my soul to be with you and my dear family, but I desire to be made willing to submit to him that rules and governs all things well; as to leave this place without liberty I don't think I can on any account."<sup>95</sup> But occasionally the burden of personal problems precluded any thought of military service. As one man expressed it when refusing a commission from the Bay

---

<sup>93</sup> Annals of Lancaster, Massachusetts, 1643-1825 (Clinton, MA, 1884), 222. The government ordered an inquiry into the conduct of the officer in charge of the Lancaster men, and his commander found that he had not been "in the least to blame, but on the contrary did all that lay in his power to promote further the design. See "Eleazer Tyng to Lt-Governor William Dummer, April 1, 1725," AAS, Mass. Coll. 1629-1869, Box 3, Folder 11, Militia returns, Officers commissions and Misc. Papers 1696-1762.

<sup>94</sup> Baxter, ed., Doc. Hist. Me., Vol. X, 277.

<sup>95</sup> Henry S. Burrage, Maine at Louisbourg in 1745 (Augusta, ME, 1910), 99.

government, "[I] do not understand that a man is so called to serve his country with the inevitable ruin and destruction of his own family; neither indeed can it be imagined, that such an one can manage his business with any comfort and courage abroad, when, by reason of his absence, things are like to succeed so ill at home; neither can he expect a blessing of God upon his undertakings."<sup>66</sup>

For Major Samuel Appleton, who commanded the men from Newbury sent north to Dover in 1689, military service could not have come at a worse time. "Besides Afflicting providence of God upon my family before I came from home in bereaving me of 2 children, I have just now advize of the death of a third together with the indisposition of my wife and the extraordinary illness of another of my children all which necessitates my hasting home, however I am so Disposed to the Defence of the Countrey and the preservation of this place in order to it that am very unwilling to give the people of this place any diacouragement by my removal till I

---

<sup>66</sup> "James Cudworth to Governor Josiah Winslow, 1673," Collections of the Massachusetts Historical Society, Series V, Vol. 6, 80-81. Cudworth declined an appointment to command a company of 100 men in an expedition against the Dutch. Although this quote predates the period under discussion, it is the best articulation of this point of view I have found. Incidentally, one of Cudworth's reasons for declining the command would make an interesting advertisement for the American Cancer Society: "The estate and condition of my family is such, as will not admit of such a thing...[wife is sixty-seven and very weak] ...she cannot lay for want of breath, and when she is up, she cannot light a pipe of tobacco, but it must be lighted for her; and until she has taken two or three pipes, for want of breath, she is not able to stir."

have your Honors Answer."<sup>97</sup> In 1725, marital problems prompted Captain Samuel Hincks to petition for dismissal. "My interest at Portsmouth is partly Disposed of with Loss," he wrote. "my wife left that place and is at Boston where she lately gone and my private affairs are in confusion tho I neglect no duty."<sup>98</sup>

In addition to communities and families, the economies of the northern New England provinces as a whole suffered as well, for almost all of the soldiers contributed to the economy in some way, if only as laborers.<sup>99</sup> In 1710 Governor Joseph Dudley informed the Board of Trade that men are "necessarily taken off from their labour into the service of the war, to guard the frontiers, and this year especially to that degree that every fifth man in the Province was obliged to serve, there being 2,000 of this Province in armes, and our lists of the whole in ordinary make but 10,000."<sup>100</sup> Reduction in the production of naval stores for the British navy in particular had repercussions

---

<sup>97</sup> Baxter, ed., Doc. Hist. Me., Vol. IX, 13.

<sup>98</sup> Baxter, ed., Doc. Hist. Me., Vol. X, 281. Besides the soldiers petitioning for release due to personal problems, the records are filled with requests from the families for their soldiers to be returned. See Trask, Letters of Colonel Thomas Westbrook, 94; Baxter, ed., Doc. Hist. Me., Vol. V, 137; and Chapter One for the story of the Ryly family.

<sup>99</sup> For some examples see Baxter, ed., Doc. Hist. Me., Vol. V, 49-50, 53.

<sup>100</sup> "Governor Joseph Dudley to Council of Trade and Plantations, January 31, 1710," Calendar of State Papers, Vol. 25, No. 81.

in the highest levels of the English government. In reply to the concerns over Naval stores expressed by Whitehall during Queen Anne's War, Governor Dudley could only indicate that among his soldiers in service "are all my loose people that should be employed in those manufactories."<sup>101</sup>

The common thread tying all these concerns together, and perhaps the principal consideration for enlistment, was length of service. Most duty was short term, patrols and scouts for example, and troops raised for general duty on the frontier rarely served for more than a year.<sup>102</sup> Recruitment proclamations for expeditions habitually included the assurance, "to satisfie the countrie troops", that provincial soldiers would not be made to remain as a garrison against their will.<sup>103</sup> More than any other consideration, the time spent away from community, family and employment concerned New England men the most, and any attempt to hold them in service caused deep resentment.

The issue of enforced absence came to a head at Louisbourg. Governor William Shirley and William Pepperrell found themselves embarrassed by success. Having captured the French fortress they now had to hold on to it. Unfor-

---

<sup>101</sup> "Governor Joseph Dudley to Council of Trade and Plantations, November 15, 1710," Calendar of State Papers, Vol. 25, No. 491.

<sup>102</sup> See Chapter Two and Three.

<sup>103</sup> "Francis Nicholson and Samuel Vetch to Earl of Sunderland, June 28, 1709," Calendar of State Papers, Vol. 24, No. 604; Hammond, ed., NHSP, Vol XVIII, 106. The British promised to return the provincials from Cartagena to their homes at Crown expense.



tunately for Shirley, his men had expected to go home after Louisbourg fell, preferably with their pockets lined with plunder.<sup>104</sup> Now they would have to remain for an indeterminate time.<sup>105</sup>

Shirley did allow a few soldiers to return home. Nine days after the surrender he suggested to Pepperrell that the lame and sick, and "any persons who are under contracts for masts" be allowed to leave.<sup>106</sup> But in early July he had a letter read to the army in which he congratulated the men on their "glorious acquisition" and charged them to "preserve it from falling again into the enemy's hands." Shirley also hoped they would not "sully the honour of their arms by any murmurs or discontent or strife."<sup>107</sup> The murmurs and discontent grew throughout the summer despite Shirley's

---

<sup>104</sup> The provincials felt they had been raised for "reducing" Louisbourg, not for "garrisoning" the fortress, and maintained a keen awareness of the distinction between the two terms. See Chapter Five for more on this perception. The Eighth Regiment arrived after the surrender and confidently expected to be immediately sent home, the job accomplished by others. Their request was denied. See "Pepperrell Papers," Colls. Mass. Hist. Soc., Series VI, Vol. X, 34.

<sup>105</sup> Shirley had expected the British to assume responsibility for the fort, and provide a garrison. But Whitehall was focused on the Jacobite Rebellion of Charles Stuart, and was not about to dispatch redcoats across the Atlantic until the threat to the Hanover dynasty was stopped. Even if Bonnie Prince Charlie had not made his bid to place his father on the throne, it would have taken some months for the British to send a garrison to Louisbourg.

<sup>106</sup> "Pepperrell Papers," Colls. Mass. Hist. Soc., Series VI, Vol. X, 30.

<sup>107</sup> "Pepperrell Papers," Colls. Mass. Hist. Soc., Series VI, Vol. X, 320-22.

admonitions. At the end of July the Governor advised his general to keep all the men except those belonging to "exposed Eastern parts."<sup>108</sup>

The murmurs and discontent grew to a threatened mutiny by mid-September. Added to the poor pay and lack of plunder, the forced extension of their service had angered the provincial soldiers to the point of rebellion.<sup>109</sup> Ragged, lousy, sick, disappointed and homesick, the New England soldiers wanted to go home. Only an appearance and speech by Shirley himself averted disaster. Still the discontent continued, the soldiers "uneasy at their prospect of being detained here from their families till Spring, and some of them for want of cloaths."<sup>110</sup> The Assembly of Massachusetts became concerned that the extended service had reduced "due confidence in the promises of the government."<sup>111</sup>

In early October one man from each company was allowed to return to New England to gather clothing and supplies for their comrades.<sup>112</sup> By the end of October and into early

---

<sup>108</sup> "Pepperrell Papers," Colls. Mass. Hist. Soc., Series VI, Vol. X, 339. Clashes with the Eastern Indians were growing throughout the summer. Shirley would declare war on the tribes in late August.

<sup>109</sup> "Pepperrell Papers," Colls. Mass. Hist. Soc., Series VI, Vol. X, 45.

<sup>110</sup> "Pepperrell Papers," Colls. Mass. Hist. Soc., Series VI, Vol. X, 47.

<sup>111</sup> Quoted in Pencak, War, Politics and Revolution, 123

<sup>112</sup> "Pepperrell Papers," Colls. Mass. Hist. Soc., Series VI, Vol. X, 49. Actually, this had been done throughout

November, soldiers raised as reinforcements and replacements began to arrive, and some of the original volunteers were allowed to go home.<sup>113</sup> But the damage had been done, and many a disillusioned soldier left Louisbourg vowing never to serve on an expedition again.<sup>114</sup>

With the various incentives, the press, the commitment to community, family and occupation, and the complications of occasional extended service, who did serve in the provincial forces of New England? And why did they? Many historians probing this question over the past twenty-five years have tended to agree with the assessment suggested by John

---

the summer by individual unit commanders on a case by case basis. Samuel Moore, commanding the New Hampshire regiment, gave the following pass to George Creighton on September 3; "As you have been chosen by the Remaining Part of that company to which you belong to Return to New England in order to Procure and take care of such things as their Friends may see fit to send them, You have hereby leave of Absence to return as aforesaid and when you have done that business, in which you are to use dispatch, proceed to this place by the first convenient opportunity to your duty." See New Hampshire Archives, Military Correspondence, 1745,46,48,49.

<sup>113</sup> With so many men at Louisbourg, finding replacements was not easy, as the government of New Hampshire found, "men being now more stragling that when the last volunteers were raised." - "Journal of the House, June 20, 1745," Bouton, ed., NHSP, Vol. V, 341.

<sup>114</sup> As one anonymous soldier expressed the feeling:

Faire Well Cape: Britton  
 faire well all you fases  
 That Bread Such Disgreases  
 a gainst Solders that are True to their King  
 for I boldely Do Say  
 If they once git away  
 Your will Be hard Poot to it to Catch them again

De Forest, Louisbourg Journals, 96.

Shy in 1963. Discussing the "changing character of recruitment in the eighteenth century", Shy theorized that "a growing number of those who did the actual fighting were not the men who bore a military obligation as part of their freedom ... with more social pariahs filling the ranks, and military objectives less clearly connected to parochial interests, respectable men felt not so impelled by a sense of duty or guilt to take up arms." Shy concluded that "fighting had ceased to be a function of the community as such."<sup>115</sup> James Kirby Martin and Mark Edward Lender concurred with this theory, believing that "those who were expendable in society - the down and outers - were deemed to be the appropriate persons to be sent off to engage in full-scale combat at some distant point on the map."<sup>116</sup> As colonial society detached itself from military obligation, its soldiers became more mercenary, they would be, according to Martin and Lender, the "field substitutes for more favored, property-holding militiamen."<sup>117</sup>

---

<sup>115</sup> John Shy, "A New Look at Colonial Militia," in A People Numerous and Armed: Reflections on the Military Struggle for American Independence (London, 1976), 29-30. For similar sentiments see Cress, Citizens in Arms, 13, and Mahon, History of the Militia, 21.

<sup>116</sup> Martin and Lender, A Respectable Army, 18.

<sup>117</sup> Martin and Lender, A Respectable Army, 17. Once again, British observations seem to support this theory. Lord Loudon, British commander in the last French and Indian war, complained that the New England soldiers "are not the men they use[d] to send out, but fellows hired by other men who should have gone themselves." Quoted in Fred Anderson, A People's Army: Massachusetts Soldiers and Society in the Seven Years War (Chapel Hill, NC, 1984), 52.

However, some recent studies have contradicted this impression. Fred Anderson examined Massachusetts soldiers who served in the last French war and disagreed with the conclusion they were desperate volunteers seeking relief from their lowly status, or hired men substituting for disinterested militiamen. On the contrary, eighty-eight percent of the provincial soldiers were volunteers, only two percent were pressed and ten percent hired.<sup>118</sup> "The soldiers patterns of occupation, residence and movement before enlistment give little indication that these were men driven by necessity into military service." Anderson found that Massachusetts soldiers were not "second-class, hireling manpower," but for the most part young men who sought to increase their prospects for independence from parental control through military service.<sup>119</sup>

Similarly, Myron O. Stachiw studied Massachusetts soldiers in Dummer's War and the Cartagena campaign and recognized three distinct types of recruits. First were young, unmarried sons of locally prominent families who had not received their inheritance and enlisted for adventure and booty. The second category were middle sons of less wealthy families who were not expected to inherit a great deal of land. Enlistment meant a better, or quicker, start

---

<sup>118</sup> Fred Anderson, "A People's Army: Provincial Military Service in Massachusetts during the Seven Years War," William and Mary Quarterly, 3rd Series, 40 (October, 1983), 505.

<sup>119</sup> Anderson, "A People's Army," WMQ, 3rd Series, 40 (October, 1983), 509, 520-21, 525.

in life, or, for older men, a chance for land grants or booty to provide for their own sons. The families of these soldiers often had a long record of military service. Finally, there were men of little property, the "loose people," whose service is emphasized by John Shy and the others.<sup>120</sup>

An inquiry into the men who performed active military service from Dover, New Hampshire in 1745 reinforces the theory that provincials were not drawn principally from the disadvantaged in New England society. Fifty-one men have been identified as enlisting for the Louisbourg campaign from the New Hampshire community, and, while they were away, forty more spent a week in August patrolling the woods north of Rochester.<sup>121</sup> Although the type of service was quite different, the former an expedition involving a sea voyage and a minimum of three to four months away from home, the latter a short, local patrol, the profile of the men who

---

<sup>120</sup> Myron O. Stachiw, ed., Massachusetts Officers and Soldiers 1723-43: Dummer's War to the War of Jenkin's Ear (NEHGS, Mass., 1979), xiv-xv.

<sup>121</sup> George Gilmore, Roll of New Hampshire Men at Louisbourg, Cape Breton, 1745 (Concord, NH, 1896). The number of men from Dover is probably not complete as not all the names on the roll of the New Hampshire regiment provide residence. For roll of the August patrol, see "Muster roll of Captain Joseph Hanson, August 5, 1745" in Isaac W. Hammond, ed., Rolls and Documents relating to Soldiers in the Revolutionary War with an Appendix Embracing some Indian and French Rolls, (Manchester, NH, 1887), New Hampshire Provincial and State Papers, Vol. XVI, 904.

served in both was exactly the same.<sup>122</sup> Of the ninety-one soldiers from Dover, seventeen are obscure, simply names on the roll. No records exist and their family names are not recognized as prominent in the town records, and indeed, probably represent the down and outers of Dover society. Of the fifty-one whose ages are known, only one was under twenty. Twenty-six fell between 20-29, six were 30-39 and eighteen were forty or over, including two men who were fifty-nine when they went to Louisbourg.

Of the twenty-seven men whose marital status could be discovered, eight were single, and with one exception, those who were married had either been married less than eight years, or more than seventeen. The middle range of years married, eight to seventeen, was missing from both companies.<sup>123</sup> Coupled with the low number of men in their

---

<sup>122</sup> Vital data on the Dover men was obtained from various sources, including: Collections of the Dover, N. H. Historical Society (Dover, NH, 1894), Vol I; John R. Ham, "Dover, New Hampshire Marriages, 1623-1823" (Manuscript, Dover, NH Public Library); Rev. Dr. Alonzo Hall Quint, Historical Memoranda concerning Persons and Places in Old Dover, N. H. (Dover Public Library); John Scales, History of Dover, N. H. (Manchester, NH, 1923), Vol. I; Descendents of William Dam (Dover Public Library); Katherine F. Richmond, John Hayes of Dover, New Hampshire: A Book of his Family (Tyngsboro, MA, 1936); Rev. Charles Nelson Sinnett, Richard Pinkham of Old Dover, New Hampshire and his Descendents East and West (Concord, NH, 1908).

<sup>123</sup> The records for Dover, like so many communities, are incomplete. For example, the one exception to the missing middle range was Sergeant Benjamin Libby who had been married eleven years when he went to Louisbourg. He was also fifty-two and was the only married man from Dover to remain at Louisbourg over the winter. A marriage at forty-one suggests a second wife, but no record exists of a first marriage.

thirties this figure is suggestive, but only suggestive. The sampling is too small to be conclusive of anything. But as a randomly chosen test, the men from Dover, New Hampshire seem to resemble more the soldiers described by Anderson and Stachiw. Many of the men who served came from prominent families in the town, with the same last names appearing in both the Louisbourg company and the patrol.<sup>124</sup> For example, the Hayes family had three men in provincial service in 1745. Elihu Hayes, a twenty-seven year old cordwainer, left his wife of six years with a two month old infant when he went to Louisbourg, and he took his apprentice, Stephen Evans, along with him. Elihu's brother, John Hayes, thirty-four and single, went on patrol that summer, along with their first cousin, Ichabod Hayes, who would later achieve some social standing as town moderator in 1766.<sup>125</sup> Actually, Stephen Evans, the cordwainer's apprentice, would accomplish even more. He later gained considerable wealth from trade and shipbuilding, served as moderator and selectman, chosen representative to New Hampshire's revolutionary Assembly in 1775 and 1776, and commanded a

---

<sup>124</sup> In fact, that is how the patrol was identified as no town of origin was included with the names. But after working with the names of the Louisbourg men, a glance at the patrol list produced strange feelings of *déjà vu*. Subsequent research confirmed the hunch that most of the patrol came from Dover.

<sup>125</sup> George Wadleigh, Notable Events in the History of Dover from the First Settlement in 1623 to 1865 (Dover, NH, 1913), 141; Richmond, John Hayes of Dover, New Hampshire, 62-63.



regiment at Saratoga, becoming New Hampshire's highest ranking soldier.<sup>126</sup>

Answering the question of who preformed active service and why they did so is not an easy task. The conclusions are so often diluted through generalization and a glut of exceptions. As in all human endeavors, the reasons men go to war are almost as varied as the number of participants involved. The decision is a personal one, and can result from mere impulse or a careful consideration of all potential rewards and consequences. According to Myron Stachiw, war signified several things to provincial soldiers, including escape, self-improvement, adventure and a show of patriotism, and to this list can be added the motives of revenge and religious fervor.<sup>127</sup>

Recruits escaped from debt, family conflict, unemployment or servitude. Bounties, plunder and even wages attracted those seeking self-improvement - including independence from parental control or the ability to provide independence for children. Expeditions and major raids attracted those seeking adventure, whether the young sowing wild oats before marriage and commitment, or the old wanting a last fling before the end of life itself. New Englanders also served out of a sense of duty and patriotism to their

---

<sup>126</sup> Collections of the Dover Historical Society, 35; Wadleigh, Notable Events in the History of Dover, 141; Quint, Historical Memoranda, 6, 295.

<sup>127</sup> Stachiw, ed., Massachusetts Officers and Soldiers, xxii-xxiii.

community, province and king, as well as an obligation to their church and God. Finally, for those living on the frontier, military service offered an opportunity for revenge, a chance to strike back for the loss of property and loved ones. For individual New Englanders pondering their future, any combination of these reasons could influence their decision to "go for a soldier."<sup>128</sup>

The answer to the question of who served, and equally important, who did not, is only slightly less complex, but perhaps placed on a firmer foundation. The recent research of Fred Anderson, Myron Stachiw and others points away from the theory that between 1689 and 1763, the provincial soldiers of New England were drawn increasingly from the outcasts and downtrodden in society, forced to serve by economic pressures or by the government through the press. The evidence seems to indicate that provincial service attracted the same soldiers throughout the French wars. First, they were volunteers, with only a relatively small percentage of pressed or hired men. Second, they came from one of four major groups: 1. Single men of established families, including young men serving with their fathers or on their own, or older men, bachelors or widowers, all usually seeking some adventure or a change of pace; 2. Those young men recently married or about to be, seeking independence from parents, or simply a better start for

---

<sup>128</sup> These reasons influenced not only the decision to enlist, but the fighting spirit as well. For more on this see Chapter Nine.

their new families; 3. Older men with children approaching the age of independence who needed to be provided for; 4. The downtrodden and destitute did obviously perform military service as well, men who volunteered because they had nowhere else to turn. Absent from the list are middle-aged men with large families on whom the economic pressures of maintaining the farm or trade descended the hardest.

The one exception to this picture is involvement in extended service. Here the contrast with regular service is quite startling, and the image of the New England soldier closely resembles that portrayed by Shy, Martin and Lender and the others. When performing patrols, raids, expeditions and even garrison duty at frontier forts in time of war, the four groups enumerated above composed the forces involved. But the lonely vigils at garrison houses, at provincial forts between conflicts, at Port Royal after 1710 and Louisbourg after October, 1745 were left to the outcasts and downtrodden, to the pressed and hired men.

Anathema to New England men, extended military service was avoided if at all possible. Provincial commanders on the frontier put their pressed and hired men in the garrison houses, keeping their more reliable volunteers for patrols and raiding,<sup>129</sup> and only a desperate or a pressed man would garrison a fort during peacetime. A survey of company rolls taken in September and November at Louisbourg reveals that, with the exception of officers, it was overwhelmingly the

---

<sup>129</sup> See Chapter Two.

single men and those names without records who remained behind.<sup>130</sup>

With the exception of the small number of pressed and hired men; the typical provincial soldier did not separate "military service from the responsibilities of citizenship,"<sup>131</sup> but undoubtedly weighed the obligation to community and province along with the economic advantages when deciding to enlist. Only extended tours made men balk, revealing the weakness of the New England military system, and thrusting those "expendable" members of society into the forefront of provincial service.

---

<sup>130</sup> "Pepperrell Papers," Colls. Mass. Hist. Soc., Series VI, Vol. X. During the period of the mutiny, company rolls were drawn up indicated which men were married and how many children they had, as well as their physical condition at that time. This was in anticipation of sending men home. The comparison involved the September rolls with those taken in November. For example, Ephraim Baker's company from Boston, Hopkinton and Framingham had four married privates in September, but only one remained in November, but of ten single men, nine remained. Peter Staple's company from a "frontier town" in Maine had eleven married men in September, four remained, but sixteen of eighteen single men stayed. John Storer's Company from Wells had twelve married men of whom six were listed in November, eleven of the original thirteen single men were also listed. And in Thomas Perkins company, all five married privates went home, while only five of eleven single men were allowed to leave. Incidentally, only nine of Dover's Fifty-one men stayed at Louisbourg, one was sergeant Benjamin Libby, and of the eight privates, five were single and three were obscure.

<sup>131</sup> Cress, Citizens in Arms, 13.

## CHAPTER EIGHT

### CHOSEN TO LEAD

The ability of the provincial governments of northern New England to recruit soldiers and undertake military operations depended mainly on their officers. Despite the incentives, the propaganda, and the press, the decision to serve often centered on who the soldier would serve under, and once constituted the probability of any provincial force accomplishing the objectives set forth by the government rested on the competency and skill of the officers involved. Therefore, the historical impression of inconsistency and ineptitude of New England soldiers has been frequently connected with a lack of experience and proficiency on the part of provincial military leaders at all levels. As James Kirby Martin and Mark Edward Lender wrote, "the lack of solid training and combat experience on the part of popularly elected officers ... was one reason for the militia's uneven record."<sup>1</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> James Kirby Martin and Mark Edward Lender, A Respectable Army: The Military Origins of the Republic, 1763-1789 (Arlington Heights, IL, 1982), 18.

The onus of "popular election" in particular has fostered the belief that provincial officers could not control their men. According to historian Edward Hamilton, provincial officers "had to be popular with their men, first in order to be selected for commissioned rank, and secondly in order to hold it. All the officers to a greater or lesser extent had to be somewhat subservient to the wishes of their men, and thus it was only in a very few units that any effective discipline could be maintained."<sup>2</sup> Another historian, in a recent overview of the American army, concluded that "the Provincials' ineffectiveness resulted primarily from the unmilitary character of their officers ... captains and lieutenants who had been elected by the men of their companies seldom attempted to enforce any kind of discipline, relying on coaxing and wheedling instead of commanding."<sup>3</sup>

However, this interpretation again blurs the lines between the militia and provincial service. The election of men to be nominated for the administrative and political position of militia officer should not be confused with the selection of provincial military leaders.<sup>4</sup> Provincial

---

<sup>2</sup> Edward P. Hamilton, The French and Indian Wars: The story of Battles and Forts in the Wilderness (New York, 1962), 93.

<sup>3</sup> Col. John Elting, American Army Life (New York, 1982), 9. See also Howard H. Peckham, The Colonial Wars, 1689-1762 (Chicago, 1964), 215.

<sup>4</sup> As Morrison Sharp observed, the duties of militia officers "were limited to drilling their men, keeping their muster rolls, and inspecting the home-stored supplies

soldiers chose their officers not through an election process, but by the willingness to enlist and serve under a particular individual. As few New England men were eager to entrust their lives to strangers, a certain familiarity with any potential officer became a common pre-requisite, but on the whole provincial officers were chosen on the basis of experience and reputation, not on their inclination to be compliant and indulgent. The ability to lead patrols and raids, to direct fire fights, to care for the well-being of their men, and achieve a modicum of success marked the successful, long-serving provincial officer. On the other hand, incompetency on a level suggested by most historical interpretations resulted in social disgrace and professional oblivion.

This is not meant to suggest that the election of officers did not occur. Early in King William's War, especially during the confusion of the Glorious Revolution when governmental authority was shaky at best, the militia practice of election and nomination of provincial officers seemed expedient in such precarious times. When raising soldiers for the frontier during the summer of 1689, the interim government of Massachusetts announced that volunteers "shall have

---

of powder, lead and guns. For fighting, the New England colonies raised special fighting companies of men ... led by specially commissioned officers." See "Leadership and Democracy in the Early New England System of Defense," American Historical Review, 5 (1945), 244-5. For more on the election of militia officers, see Chapter One.

Liberty to nominate their officers."<sup>5</sup> During the following summer, Dr. Benjamin Bullivant witnessed the confusion associated with Sir William Phip's preparations to attack Canada. Bullivant noticed that one company, encouraged by an ambitious ensign, turned on their captain, a man named Coleman. "Coleman next day hooted at by his company," recorded Bullivant in his diary. Coleman resigned and the company elected the ensign as their new captain.<sup>6</sup>

Junior officers could be replaced in the field by election within a company when time and circumstances warranted. For example, in September, 1725, Samuel Willard,

---

<sup>5</sup> "Recruiting proclamation for July 2, 1689," James Phinney Baxter, ed., Documentary History of the State of Maine (Portland, ME, 1907), Collections of the Maine Historical Society, 2nd Series, Vol. IX, 7.

<sup>6</sup> "The Journal of Dr. Benjamin Bullivant," Proceedings of the Massachusetts Historical Society, Vol XVI, First Series, 107. The period between 1688 and 1692 was a particularly unsettled one for the New England provincial forces, due in large part to the overturning of the government during the Glorious Revolution, and the complaints against military officers, and government authority in general, are numerous. Beginning with the accusations against the British officers under Andros during the fall and winter campaign of 1688-89 (see below), and continuing until after forming of a new government in 1693, the records are filled with grievances and minor rebellions as witnessed by Bullivant. For example, soldiers stationed at Wells in 1691 asked the Bay government to "Remoove Cornelius Creek from being a Commander over us: we Judge him not Capable for any Command, we are not able to bare his Cursing and Swareing and tireany over us." However, the soldiers could not simply vote the officer out, the government had to remove him. See "Letter from John Alen and others to the Governor and Council," James Phinney Baxter, ed., Documentary History of the State of Maine (Portland, ME, 1897), Collections of the Maine Historical Society, 2nd Series, Vol. V, 295-6. For more on the unsettled conditions on the frontier, see Chapter One.



commanding a scouting force from Dunstable, reported to Lt-Governor William Dummer that his lieutenant had taken ill and could not proceed with the company. To supply a replacement quickly, Willard requested that "a blank Commission might be sent me to be bestowed upon one whom the Company is desirous to choose among themselves."<sup>7</sup>

However, such incidents were exceptional. The New England governments gave commissions to their officers based on several criteria including recommendations from military, provincial and local leaders, prior service, or special circumstances. The soldiers approved of the choice by their willingness to volunteer.<sup>8</sup> There was no popular election, no drawing of lots. When quotas were sent to the local militia, the companies were assembled and the intended service described, including who would be commanding both the company and the overall operation. In most cases the company commander would be from either that town or a neighboring community, and thus well known to the potential recruits. Provincial officers given "beating orders" who presented themselves before militia assemblies or other gatherings, had to promote not only the intended operation, but themselves as well.<sup>9</sup> Dr. Alexander Bulman found the men

---

<sup>7</sup> "Samuel Willard to Dummer, September 7, 1725," Annals of Lancaster, Massachusetts, 1643-1825 (Clinton, MA, 1884), 235.

<sup>8</sup> Pressed men had little choice, except if they had the money to buy their way out of the service.

<sup>9</sup> See below and Chapter Seven.

of York enthusiastic over the prospects of attacking Louisbourg, but even with general approval of the design, "some decline enlisting till they know who shall be the general officers as also who shall be their particular Captain."<sup>10</sup> As Fred Anderson found during the last French war, the decision to enlist meant choosing a leader.<sup>11</sup>

Unfortunately, the language employed in certain instances has only served to create confusion. When Governor Jonathan Belcher issued his recruiting proclamation for the Cartagena expedition, he emphasized that "to the intent that all Persons proposing to engage in the said service, may have their election of the Captains in whose Companys they would enlist; I shall order the names of the Captains and other Commission officers to be appointed by me for this service to be printed in the weekly newspapers."<sup>12</sup> The process would have been clearer if the word "selection" had replaced "election," because recruits were being offered a list of men from whom they could choose one to serve with. This selection was important because once made, there was no turning back, only death, desertion or discharge could

---

<sup>10</sup> "Bulman to William Pepperrell, February 4, 1745," Charles Edward Banks, History of York, Maine (Boston, 1931-5), Vol. I, 333-4.

<sup>11</sup> Fred Anderson, A People's Army: Massachusetts Soldiers and Society in the Seven Years War (Chapel Hill, NC, 1984), 48.

<sup>12</sup> "Governor Belcher's Proclamation to Encourage Enlistments in the Service against Spain, Jul 11, 1740," Isaac Hammond, ed., Miscellaneous Provincial and State Papers (Manchester, NH, 1890) New Hampshire Provincial and State Papers, Vol XVIII, 110-2

release a provincial soldier from the control of his company officer. But the freedom of choice was so important to the New England military system that levying act of 1721 included the guarantee that a volunteer could not "be put off from one company to another, without his free consent."<sup>13</sup>

The New England governments found their officers in a variety of ways. Field rank officers, those who commanded districts on the frontier, larger raids and expeditions, tended to be drawn from the upper ranks of society. For example, Winthrop Hilton, who initiated winter raids during Queen Anne's War and commanded one of the two regiments at Port Royal in 1707, descended from John Winthrop and Samuel Dudley, and was prominent in the mast trade. He would be nominated for membership on the New Hampshire Council before his death in 1710.<sup>14</sup> Thomas Westbrook, commander of the Maine frontier during Dummer's War, was the son of a member of the New Hampshire Council, and a prominent merchant and land speculator in his own right.<sup>15</sup> William Pepperrell had been a leading citizen of Kittery, Maine, and colonel of the

---

<sup>13</sup> "Levying Act of 1721-2," Background of Selective Service (Washington, 1947), Vol II, Massachusetts Militia Laws, 160-1.

<sup>14</sup> Jeremy Belknap, The History of New Hampshire (Reprint of 1831 edition, New York, 1970) Vol 1, 178; "Orders of Queen in Council, March 20, 1707," Calendar of State Papers, Colonial Series, America and West Indies, 1706-1708 (Reprint of 1916 edition, Vaduz, 1964), Vol. 23, No. 813.

<sup>15</sup> William Blake Trask, Letters of Colonel Thomas Westbrook and others Relative to Indian Affairs in Maine, 1722-1726 (Boston, 1901), 2.

York county militia regiment before being appointed to command the Louisbourg expedition.<sup>16</sup>

In an unpublished study of New Hampshire officers serving in the French wars, Ranz Esbenshade found that of twenty field grade officers studied, eighteen had held political office prior to their command, either in the Assembly or on the Council. Only one of the twenty was commissioned without any previous military exposure, although only eight had been provincial officers at the company level, the remainder having held high rank in the militia regiments.<sup>17</sup>

The fact that the provincial government chose its commanders from the upper class is not surprising, it would be hard to find any government in the history of warfare who placed the conduct of a military operation in the hands of an unknown individual drawn from the lowest ranks of their society. It was essential for recruitment that the soldiers have confidence in both their company officer and their overall commander. The former could recruit successfully with a local reputation, but the latter needed a status which extended over a wider geographic area. As Jeremy Belknap said when discussing the choice of Pepperrell to lead the Louisbourg expedition, an unblemished reputation and engaging manners

---

<sup>16</sup> Belknap, The History of New Hampshire, 271.

<sup>17</sup> Ranz C. Esbenshade, "Sober, Modest Men of Confined Ideas: The Officer Corps of Provincial New Hampshire" (Masters Thesis, University of New Hampshire, 1976), 37-38, 52.

were absolutely necessary in the commander of an army of volunteers, his own countrymen, who were to quit their domestic connections and employments, and engage in a hazardous enterprise, which none of them, from the highest to the lowest, knew how to conduct. Professional skill and experience were entirely out of the question; had these qualities been necessary, the expedition must have been laid aside; for there was no person in New-England, in these respects qualified for the command. Fidelity, resolution and popularity must supply the place of military talents; and Pepperrell was possessed of these. It was necessary that the men should know and love their general, or they would not enlist under him.<sup>18</sup>

For company level command, however, the provincial governments could draw from a greater reservoir of candidates, and here, perhaps because the criteria were less restrictive, they achieved far greater results. One source of names came from recommendations provided by politicians, local political and militia leaders, and other provincial officers. Throughout the French war period, especially in preparation for expeditions and major raids, the Governors, Lt-Governors, members of the Assembly and Council, and field commanders were approached by individuals, by letter or in person, requesting a provincial commission for their son,

---

<sup>18</sup> Belknap, The History of New Hampshire, 271.

nephew or neighbor.<sup>19</sup> William Pepperrell was bombarded with recommendations for young men after his victory at Louisbourg,<sup>20</sup> although in one instance there was a change of heart. Nathaniel Sparhawk withdrew an earlier recommendation, saying "as to young Royall I am very sorry I was prevailed on the say a word on his behalf. His uncle imposed on me. after I wrote I found him to be the most worthless wretch; so I hope you will have taken no notice of him, at least to the disadvantage of any person living."<sup>21</sup>

Many of the recommendations, especially those from provincial officers, concerned men who had distinguished themselves through their service as privates and non-commissioned officers.<sup>22</sup> Many provincial officers came up from the ranks, learning from practical experience and the tutorage of other officers. Finding military life appealing, these individuals often achieved fame and further advancement through repeated service. John Goffe, who would lead numerous scouts during King George's War and rise to

---

<sup>19</sup> "Petition of John Hammond," Baxter, ed., Doc. Hist. Me., Vol. V, 333.

<sup>20</sup> "Pepperrell Papers," Collections of the Massachusetts Historical Society, Series VI, Vol. X (1899), 308, 343-4, 345. Thomas Hubbard recommended the young man who delivered the letter to Pepperrell for him.

<sup>21</sup> "Nathaniel Sparhawk to William Pepperrell, August 17, 1745," "Pepperrell Papers," Colls. Mass. Hist. Soc., Series VI, Vol. X, 361-2.

<sup>22</sup> Baxter, ed., Doc. Hist. Me., Vol. V, 327-8. For example, in 1692 James Converse recommended "one Ebenezer Hills who had formerly been a Sergeant with me and behaved himselfe very well, and since that to Canadai in the like Capasety" for the rank of ensign.

the provincial rank of Lieutenant-Colonel during the last French war, began his military career as a private under John Lovewell in 1725. Eleazer Melvin, another private serving with Lovewell on his last raid, achieved some fame as an officer of scouts based at Fort Dummer and at Number Four in the 1740's. Jeremiah Moulton, of York, Maine, began Dummer's War as a sergeant, quickly rose to lieutenant, then captain, and eventually colonel of a regiment sent to Louisbourg.<sup>23</sup> Even the most famous provincial officer in all the French wars, Robert Rogers, initiated his illustrious career as a private under Captain Daniel Ladd patrolling the New Hampshire frontier in 1746.<sup>24</sup>

Another source of company officers were former Indian captives whose special knowledge of language and terrain prepared them for frontier service. In this instance the terrifying episode of captivity altered the direction of their lives, thrusting them through fate into a military career. When John Gyles was captured at Pemaquid in 1689, he probably had no concept of a future life beyond that of a farmer like his father. But kept among the Eastern Indian

---

<sup>23</sup> Banks, History of York, Maine, Vol. I, 322-5, 333. Another York native would rise to military heights. Jedediah Preble served as a private in scouts during Dummer's War, and apparently went to Louisbourg with John Storer of Wells. During the last French war he would be a colonel of provincial troops. See pages 330, 340.

<sup>24</sup> Chandler E. Potter, The Military History of New Hampshire from its Founding until the Present Time (Report of the Adjutant-General of the State of New Hampshire for the Year ending June 1, 1866, Concord, NH, 1866), 93-5.

tribes for the remainder of King William's War, he became a prominent interpreter for the Bay government and eventually rose to fort commander on the Maine frontier.<sup>25</sup>

Other officers, especially those involved in raids, probes and scalp hunting, found military service an extension of their peacetime occupation of hunter and woodsmen. While most hunters became guides or pilots, a few managed to achieve status as leaders of men. The most obvious example is John Lovewell who was known as a successful woodsman, but John Goffe's father had been a prominent hunter as well, and undoubtedly passed his experience on to his son.<sup>26</sup>

In rising from the ranks, company level provincial officers contrasted starkly with their counterparts in the British army. Fred Anderson found in the last French war that "when soldier's occupations are analyzed with respect to rank, the most striking characteristic to emerge is the absence of any clear-cut division between officers and

---

<sup>25</sup> John Gyles, Memoirs of Odd Adventures, Strange Deliverances, &c. (Boston, 1736, facsimile reprint in The Garland Library of Narratives of North American Indian Captivities, New York, 1977), 41-44. See Chapter Three. Similarly, John Stark's captivity in 1752 made him valuable as a pilot for provincial raiding parties early in the last French war, eventually leading him to a commission under Robert Rogers and undying fame as the hero of Bennington in the American Revolution. See Howard Parker Moore, A Life of General John Stark of New Hampshire (New York, 1949).

<sup>26</sup> Samuel Penhallow, The History of the Wars of New England with the Eastern Indians (Boston, 1726; Facsimile Reprint, Annotated by Edward Wheelock, Williamstown, MA, 1973), 110; Charles E. Clark, The Eastern Frontier: The Settlement of Northern New England, 1610-1763 (New York, 1970), 235.



enlisted men with respect to civilian livelihoods. ... In the Massachusetts regiments ... over half of the company-grade officers had manual occupations and, indeed, followed the same ones as privates."<sup>27</sup> Provincial commanders and their governments were not above ignoring social standing and even military protocol in advancing experienced and talented men in rank. As the Bay government told Colonel Thomas Westbrook during Dummer's War, though preference should be given to officers according to seniority, he could advance younger officers are "more than Ordinary Useful."<sup>28</sup>

In the British army, a commission did not depend on experience or ability as much as it did on wealth and social status.<sup>29</sup> Most British officers held their commission through the purchase system which placed a monetary value on military rank so high it would exclude all those outside at least the gentry class. Those few who achieved a commission from the ranks or outside the gentry class did so only after long service or under the extraordinary demands and vacancies created by major wars. Since they could not possibly

---

<sup>27</sup> Fred Anderson, "A People's Army: Provincial Military Service in Massachusetts During the Seven Year's War," William and Mary Quarterly, 3rd Series, 40 (Oct., 1983), 506-7.

<sup>28</sup> Trask, Letters of Colonel Thomas Westbrook, 35.

<sup>29</sup> J. A. Houlding, Fit For Service: The Training of the British Army, 1715-95 (Oxford, 1981), 100-104; Sylvia Frey, The British Soldier in America: A Social History of Military Life in the Revolutionary Period (Austin, TX, 1981), 66.

purchase a higher rank, such individuals were generally doomed to remain at the level of their original commission.

Because their background differed so much from their own, British officers viewed provincial officers with a combination of horror and disgust. In British eyes provincial officers were "Blacksmith's, Taylors, Barbers, Shoemakers and all the Banditry them Colonies afford."<sup>30</sup> Samuel Vetch's British second-in-command at Annapolis Royal referred to the provincial officers as "a parcell of mercenary fools and pedlars."<sup>31</sup> To the English aristocrats who controlled the British army, provincial officers could never be knowledgeable or professional concerning military matters. Their colonial counterparts were, in the words of Douglas Leach, "uncultured, undisciplined ... amateurs at war."<sup>32</sup>

In the provincial service both the experience of officers and the similarity with their men regarding occupation and social status encouraged recruiting. While overall commanders were often chosen for their familiarity, even, in some cases, their notoriety, among the general

---

<sup>30</sup> Quoted in Douglas Edward Leach, Roots of Conflict: British Armed Forces and Colonial Americans, 1677-1763 (Chapel Hill, NC, 1986), 55.

<sup>31</sup> "Lt-Governor Caulfield and Captain of the Garrison of Annapolis Royal to Governor Francis Nicholson, October 8, 1714," Calendar of State Papers, Colonial Series, America and West Indies, August, 1714-December, 1715 (Reprint of 1928 edition, Vaduz, 1964), Vol. 28, No. 411 i.

<sup>32</sup> Leach, Roots of Conflict, 164.

population,<sup>33</sup> company grade officers had to draw on their reputations as successful and experienced military leaders, as well as their personal standing in their communities in order to encourage men to enlist in their companies.

Fred Anderson discovered that officers drew on family relationships and close friends in recruiting, and thus "the provincial regiments [in the French and Indian War] were in some measure bound by kinship ties."<sup>34</sup> Anderson believed the "operation of the provincial forces depended on personal contacts between officers and enlisted" and that "rather than a uniform hierarchy of officers and men, a provincial army was in fact a confederation of tiny war bands bound together by an organic network of kinship and personal loyalties."<sup>35</sup> Such close ties between officers and enlisted men was "incomprehensible to regular soldiers like the redcoats, who understood that a virtually unbridgeable chasm separated officers from other ranks."<sup>36</sup>

Anderson's conclusions can be extended throughout the early French wars as well, where company rolls also reveal

---

<sup>33</sup> Even Sir William Phips himself pointed this out in promoting an attack on Quebec in 1701. He informed the Earl of Nottingham that if he were placed in command, a sufficient number of men would volunteer without having to resort to a press. See James Phinney Baxter, ed., Documentary History of the State of Maine (Portland, ME, 1907), Collections of the Maine Historical Society, 2nd Series, Vol. X, 2-3.

<sup>34</sup> Anderson, A People's Army, 44.

<sup>35</sup> Anderson, A People's Army, 47-48.

<sup>36</sup> Anderson, A People's Army, 44.

close familial relationships between soldiers and their officers.<sup>37</sup> In addition to a network of family and friends, company level officers relied on their reputations to bring in recruits. John Storer of Wells, a man whose family had long been military leaders in the community, raised sixty-one soldiers in one day for Louisbourg, and seventeen of Johnson Harmon's snowshoe men enlisted at the old warrior's bidding.<sup>38</sup> Men such as Harmon, Benjamin Church, John Lovewell or John Goffe rarely had difficulty finding men for their scouting companies because they had a reputation as effective military leaders.

Officers commissioned by the provincial governments without such a reputation could encounter great difficulty finding recruits.<sup>39</sup> Commissioned to raise and command a company in William Pepperrell's regiment for Louisbourg, Moses Butler of Berwick, Maine informed his colonel on February 20, 1745 that "I have been very much obstructed in the affair by Sum of your Noble Officers of Berwick." The next day he wrote Pepperrell that "Jehabod Goodwin the last night had with him a considerable number of the Enlisted men at his House and ... Discouraged them from going in this Expedition with such a Sorry fellow as I am which Causes the

---

<sup>37</sup> For the effect of such relationships on combat effectiveness, see Chapter Ten.

<sup>38</sup> Burrage, Henry S., Maine at Louisbourg in 1745 (Augusta, ME, 1910), 19.

<sup>39</sup> Recruiting for unpopular service could also be difficult, see Chapter Seven.

men not to appear this day to sign the Enlistments." In fact, Butler had no success with recruiting until he found an acceptable lieutenant. On February 23, he indicated Peter Grant had volunteered to be lieutenant "which is more to the Exceptance of the People ... Mr. Grant seems to be Very Harty in the Expedition/ by this Night we shall have forty men if not more."<sup>40</sup> The history of Butler's company at Louisbourg leaves the impression that the suspicions about the captain being a "sorry fellow" were correct. The company roll in September lists Lieutenant Peter Grant in command and Captain Moses Butler as "gone home."<sup>41</sup>

Having recruited their forces, the military duties of provincial officers were enumerated in the commissions and instructions provided by the government. For service on the frontier, officers were instructed to "take care that the worship of God be duly and constantly maintained and kept amongst you; and to suffer no swearing, cursing, or other profanation of the holy name of God; and, as much as in you lies, to deter and hinder all other vices amongst your soldiers."<sup>42</sup> They were to maintain watches and wards, and

---

<sup>40</sup> "Moses Butler to William Pepperrell, February 20, 21, 23, 1745," Massachusetts Historical Society, Pepperrell Papers, Belknap Papers.

<sup>41</sup> "The True State of Capt. Butlers Company, Louisbourg, Sept 17, 1745," Mass. Hist. Soc., Pepperrell Papers, Belknap Papers. In all fairness to Moses Butler, the exact reasons for his leaving are unknown.

<sup>42</sup> Thomas Church, The History of the Great Indian War of 1675 and 1676 Commonly called Philip's War, also, The Old French and Indian Wars, from 1689 to 1704

scouting parties, and try to destroy the enemy without themselves being surprised "or otherwise betrayed by their Treachery."<sup>43</sup> Officers had to keep the government apprized of developments through reports and journals. During Dummer's War officers were expected to submit copies of their journals every two weeks.<sup>44</sup> Finally, provincial officers were ordered to "take effectual care that the Soldiers under your conduct, be kept under good order and discipline."<sup>45</sup>

The maintenance of the worship of God was generally left to the ministers who accompanied the soldiers. Paid by the government, these martial men of God administered to the souls of soldiers on expeditions and on the frontier, including those garrisoning the forts and conducting the raids. Many of them became quite militant, advising commanders like the Rev. John Wise at Quebec in 1690, or serving as a soldier such as Jonathan Fry who fell with Lovewell in 1725.<sup>46</sup>

But while ministers disciplined the spirit, the officers disciplined the soldiers. Disciplinary problems

---

(Hartford, Conn, 1845 edition, orig. pub. 1716), 210.  
Instructions for his third raid in 1692.

<sup>43</sup> Baxter, ed., Doc. Hist. Me., Vol. V, 89-90.

<sup>44</sup> Trask, Letters of Colonel Thomas Westbrook, 19.

<sup>45</sup> Baxter, ed., Doc. Hist. Me., Vol. V, 262.

<sup>46</sup> "Narrative of Mr. John Wise, Minister of God's Word at Chebacco," Proceedings of the Massachusetts Historical Society, Vol XV, 283-303; Penhallow, The History of the Wars of New England, 114. See Chapter Nine for more on military ministers..

among provincial soldiers involved such infractions as "shooting a gun on the parade", getting drunk, sleeping on watch, carelessness leading to damage or injury, and refusing to perform duty.<sup>47</sup> For such transgressions a soldier could "be punished at the discretion of the Commission officers of the Garrison Company or Troop whereto he belongs by putting into the Bilboes [stocks], laying Neck & Heels, riding the wooden horse or running the Gantlet."<sup>48</sup>

For example, Benjamin Stearns recorded in his Louisbourg journal that "Corporal Lakin orders Stephen Barron to gard the armes at which said Barron told Corporal to kiss his ass! for which abusive afrunt he ordered him to ride the pickets one [hour]."<sup>49</sup> John Burk related in his journal that two soldiers rode the horse at Number Four, both for sleeping on watch. The horse or picket was a beam suspended five or six feet above the ground on which the soldier sat. It was common for weights, such as cannon balls or muskets, to be dangled from the feet, further straining the muscles of the legs and the hip joints.<sup>50</sup>

---

<sup>47</sup> American Antiquarian Society, Curwen Family Papers, Box 3, Folder 1; "Journal of Lieutenant John Burk," Stevens Family Papers, Special Collections, University of Vermont.

<sup>48</sup> "Levying Act of 1719," New Hampshire Militia Laws, Background of Selective Service, 58.

<sup>49</sup> "Journal of Benjamin Stearns," Massachusetts Historical Society Proceedings, Vol. 42, 137-44.

<sup>50</sup> Sylvia R. Frey, "Courts and Cats: British Military Justice in the Eighteenth Century," Military Affairs, 43 (1979), 7.

To lay a man "neck and heels", the prisoner sat on the ground with his knees drawn up before him. His ankles were tied and the rope passed up between his legs and around his neck, tied off short to draw his head down toward his knees. A stick was placed under his knees, long enough to project out on each side, and his arms brought under the stick with his wrists tied together before his shins. Usually he was gagged as well by having a stick, or even a bayonet, tied in his mouth.<sup>51</sup> A soldier running the gauntlet, ran between two lines of fellow soldiers who hit him on the back with sticks or ramrods. Sometimes the guilty party was forced to carry a heavy weight to slow him down. Such a punishment could be quite severe depending on how many men were in the line and how many times they had to go through it.<sup>52</sup>

Provincial officers did not use flogging on a regular basis. One soldier at Louisbourg after the surrender received thirty-nine lashes for stealing a winding sheet off a corpse, but Louisbourg presented unusual circumstances and pressures.<sup>53</sup> Riding the horse and laying neck and heels

---

<sup>51</sup> This procedure was also called "bucking and gagging". While Pepperrell's army waited at Canso for the ice to melt around Louisbourg, a soldier carelessly fired his musket in camp, and "shot a man through the hat." The careless soldier was laid neck and heels. See Louis E. De Forest, ed., Louisbourg Journals: 1745 (New York, 1932), 6.

<sup>52</sup> Frey, The British Soldier in America, 91. The British often used the gauntlet for first time deserters, however, if the individual went through a three hundred man battalion, say five times, he could possibly receive 1,500 blows.

<sup>53</sup> De Forest, ed., Louisbourg Journals, 102.



were more common punishments, especially on the frontier line, and they were accepted by provincial soldiers as reasonable penalties for minor infractions.

If exposed to harsher punishments, colonial soldiers could be quite vocal in their complaints. When Governor Edmund Andros raised provincial soldiers for the Maine frontier in the autumn of 1688, he placed them under the command of English officers drawn from the detachment of redcoats stationed in Boston at that time. As Douglas Leach indicated in Roots of Conflict: British Armed Forces and Colonial Americans, 1677-1763, "the regular officers found the New Englanders stubbornly averse to any command they thought discriminatory or unreasonable; when the officers tried to overcome the problem with harsh discipline, the provincials quickly marked it down as bestial cruelty."<sup>84</sup> The soldiers later described frequent beating with canes and half-pikes. One Captain Lockhart beat a soldier "with his Cane, and kicked and abused him in such a wise the blood ran out of his mouth. The souldier did say upon his death, which was quickly after, that The abuse he received .. was the imediate cause of his death."<sup>85</sup>

Another soldier, accused of breaking into a store house, was tortured by a Lieutenant John Jordan for his confession. Jordan tied him up by "One hand lifted fully stretched out above his head binding the other hand behind

---

<sup>84</sup> Douglas Edward Leach, Roots of Conflict, 15.

<sup>85</sup> Baxter, ed., Doc. Hist. Me., Vol. V, 20.

him to One of his legs." The soldier was suspended over a sharp stake "so that if he indeavored to rest his Arm that Bore the whole weight of his body then was his Naked foot forced to rest (without Rest) upon the aforesaid stake for two hours together."<sup>56</sup> As Douglas Leach concluded, "Regular officers required instant, unquestioning obedience from their own men, and presumably expected the same from the colonial troops. The latter, however, were accustomed to the much looser discipline of the militia, maintained by officers with whom they were personally acquainted."<sup>57</sup>

Provincial officers rarely, if ever, resorted to the kind of physical abuse common in European armies. Putting a man on the wooden horse or laying him neck and heels for an hour was one thing, but inflicting severe punishment was quite another. In fact, colonial officers rarely punished capital offenses without the consent of the government, who would order the formation of a court-martial or even try the accused in a civil court. Both the government and the provincial officers were quite sensitive to the negative impact on recruiting a summary execution would produce. In 1692, Benjamin Church's instructions from the governor ordered him to form his own court-martial among his officers if any soldier committed an offense, and "inflict such

---

<sup>56</sup> Baxter, ed., Doc. Hist. Me., Vol. V 38-9. Jordan got no confession and had the soldier laid neck and heels for two hours more, then stretched him on a pole with his hands and feet tied behind him for another two hours.

<sup>57</sup> Leach, Roots of Conflict, 18.

punishment as the merit of the offence requires, death only excepted, which if any shall deserve, you are to secure the person, and signify the crime unto me by the first opportunity."<sup>58</sup> During a scout in 1723, commanded by Johnson Harmon, a soldier fired at a tree just as another man named Stockbridge passed near it. "The bullet struck a tree and Glancing Straingley did unhappily kill the said Stockbridge," reported Harmon. Although he was convinced it was an accident, Harmon had "confined" the man and awaited instruction from the government.<sup>59</sup> Lt-Governor Dummer replied that "the Man Slayer must be tried by a Court Martial, and I shall in a Short time give out a Commission for that Purpose. In the meantime though you are to keep him under Restraint, You need not be very rigorous and severe to him, seeing you are fully convinced as you say that the Mischief was purely accidental."<sup>60</sup>

This sensitivity to the administration of severe or capital punishment was reflected in the response to the most common offense committed by provincial soldiers - desertion. Laws passed at the close of the seventeenth century stipulated that deserters shall be "proceeded against as a felon, and shall suffer the pains of death, or some other grievous punishment." But the responsibility of administering this justice was removed from the commanders in the field.

---

<sup>58</sup> Church, The History of the Great Indian War, 210.

<sup>59</sup> Trask, Letters of Colonel Thomas Westbrook, 11-12.

<sup>60</sup> Baxter, ed., Doc. Hist. Me., Vol. IX, 474.

Deserters were to be tried by the county courts "or at a court of oyer and terminer by commissioners to be specially appointed and impowred for that purpose."<sup>61</sup>

Provincial soldiers deserted either in large groups by consensus, or as individuals. As a conscious decision expressed by a majority, or a large minority, collective desertion resulted in far less prosecution or popular indignation.<sup>62</sup> The group decision to desert occasionally had the tacit approval of the officers. After the first attempt to capture Port Royal in 1707, Governor Joseph Dudley ordered the force held together for a second attack. However, the New Hampshire soldiers deserted in droves while waiting for the decision to renew the assault. William Dudley, the Governor's son and "Secretary of War" for the expedition, reported to his father that the New Hampshire officers "do encourage or at least wink at the Desertion of their men."<sup>63</sup>

---

<sup>61</sup> Massachusetts Militia Laws, Background of Selective Service, 151. In 1746, there was some doubt expressed by Governor William Shirley that the provincial officers could legally try soldiers who had enlisted in His Majesties' service for desertion without a commission from the crown. He felt an act should be passed to enable officers to hold a court-martial in such circumstances without necessarily having their Royal commission. "I don't otherwise see how the officers can maintain a proper command over the soldiers." The soldiers in question were those posted at Fort Atkinson. See "Shirley to Wentworth, Jan 27, 1747," Hammond, ed., NHSP, Vol XVIII, 254-5.

<sup>62</sup> Baxter, ed., Doc. Hist. Me., Vol. IX, 42. For more on this incident, see Chapter Two.

<sup>63</sup> "William Dudley to Joseph Dudley, July 17, 1707," Baxter, ed., Doc. Hist. Me., Vol. IX, 245.

As in the case of Port Royal, collective desertion usually resulted from a feeling of disappointment and futility. When the men of Theodore Atkinson's regiment found themselves posted at a fort on Lake Winnepesaukee rather than assaulting Quebec in 1746, 170 of them deserted. They had enlisted to defend New Hampshire from a French attack, and to perhaps assault Quebec, not to garrison a fort on the frontier. Discouragement, frustration and boredom drove them to desert, and little was done to stop them. After all, the officers themselves were not immune to such feelings.<sup>64</sup>

Unlike collective action, desertion on an individual level rarely received understanding or approval. The act of individual desertion carried with it the risk of infamy and social disgrace, not only from fellow soldiers, many of whom were friends or relatives, but from the deserter's community as well. Perhaps the most famous incident of desertion, in this case in the face of the enemy, was that of Benjamin Hassell. Hassell was in John Lovewell's company during that last fateful raid, and believing the company destroyed by the first fire of the Indians he left the field, ostensibly to get reinforcements from the men left at the makeshift fort they had built. However, Hassell's description of the fight convinced the others that reinforcements would be too late, and all agreed to a hasty withdrawal to the

---

<sup>64</sup> Hammond, ed., NHSP, Vol XVIII, 254-5; Belknap, History of New Hampshire, 285.

settlements. Back in Dunstable, Hassell and the others reported to Eleazer Tyng, who then passed the word of Lovewell's fight on to Lt-Governor William Dummer.

Hassell's actions resulted in instant infamy. The day following Tyng's report, Dummer informed Lt-Governor John Wentworth of New Hampshire that "One of Cpt. Lovewells Men is run from him and left him engaged with the Indians at Pigwacket last Lords Day and pretends that they were overpowered by Numbers and that he saw Cpt Lovewell fall and heard him Groan, and that he him self was cutt off from the Company by the Indians Pressing between them though Hee Cant Deny but our people were charging the Enemy briskly when he left."<sup>65</sup> In his instructions to Tyng, Dummer wrote that he had "not Time at present to make any Observations on the ill Management of Hazzel & the ten Men at the Fort who have so cowardly deserted their Commander and fellow Soldiers in their Danger." Tyng was ordered to lead a company to the site of the fight, and take Hassell with him as a pilot.<sup>66</sup> However, Hassell pleaded illress and refused to accompany Tyng to the battle site.<sup>67</sup>

The men who had fled from the fort were not censured by public opinion because it was understood that their decision

---

<sup>65</sup> "Dummer to Wentworth, May 13, 1725," Baxter, ed., Doc. Hist. Me., Vol. X, 270.

<sup>66</sup> "Dummer to Tyng, May 13, 1725," Baxter, ed., Doc. Hist. Me., Vol. X 270-1,

<sup>67</sup> "Tyng to Dummer, May 14, 1725," Baxter, ed., Doc. Hist. Me., Vol. X, 271-2.

had been based on the description provided by Benjamin Hassell,<sup>68</sup> but Hassell soon became *persona non grata* in the communities along the Massachusetts frontier.<sup>69</sup> Because the threat of public disgrace was very real, effecting not only the soldier but his family as well, individual desertions rarely involved volunteers. It was the pressed men, those with few ties to the communities they left, the faceless "have-nots" assigned to garrisons and forts on the frontier who deserted.<sup>70</sup> Collective desertion, where a soldier made a statement by leaving with his friends and neighbors, was acceptable, but the abandonment of those friends, neighbors and relatives was not undertaken lightly by established freemen of New England communities.<sup>71</sup>

And in the case of desertion, as in so many aspects of the provincial military system, the influence of officers - their personalities, abilities, and standings in their

---

<sup>68</sup> John Goffe was one of them.

<sup>69</sup> The condemnation of Hassell was subdued to a certain extent because he was a cousin of John Lovewell, thus an attack on his conduct was an insult to the hero's family. The Rev. Thomas Symmes described Hassell's actions but did not mention his name. Samuel Penhallow also chose anonymity for Hassell when describing his panicked retreat from the fight. Penhallow, The History of the Wars of New England, 113, Notes, 37.

<sup>70</sup> "Complaint against Three Soldiers," Baxter, ed., Doc. Hist. Me., Vol. V, 72-73; "Letter from Francis Hooke to the Governor and Council," Baxter, ed., Doc. Hist. Me., Vol. V, 288. Hooke reported that "one Joseph Wheeler a prest soldier run away from his commander." See Chapter on Garrisons

<sup>71</sup> For more on the impact of familial and community relations in the ranks, see Chapter Nine.

communities and province - often proved to be a crucial element. Incompetent officers had little control over their men which in turn led to desertion and discipline problems.<sup>72</sup> Even competent officers could not maintain control if separated from their commands. For example, the necessity to post men at frontier garrison houses scattered an officer's company over a wide geographic area. As pressed soldiers were often assigned to these garrisons, the lack of direct supervision frequently led to desertion.<sup>73</sup>

During the upheaval of the Glorious Revolution the ability of provincial officers to control their men was impaired, and so their competency to command questioned. Joseph Prout reported to the Bay government in 1689 that the soldiers left to protect Falmouth, Maine "are most of them of Ill behavior and take little notice of their Commander, Espeshally Since their Captain went hence ... I would not reflect upon any man, but I am fully persuaded that if thay are not Speediily under a prudend Commander thier Cariage

---

<sup>72</sup> According to Thomas Hutchinson, when Governor Samuel Shute complained of desertion on the frontier in 1722, the Assembly "thought it necessary to be first satisfied, whether the desertion in the army was not owing to the unfaithfulness of the officers." Of course, the selection of officers for the force sent to guard the frontier was one of the many sore points between the governor and the Assembly. See Thomas Hutchinson, The History of the Colony and Province of Massachusetts Bay (London, 1768; reprint Cambridge, MA, 1936), 211.

<sup>73</sup> "Letter to Governor from David Parsons, May 31, 1725," AAS, Mass Col 1629-1869, Box 3, Folder 11: Militia returns, Officers Commissions and Misc. Papers, 1696-1762. See Chapter Two for more on this issue.



here will be dishonorable to God and to the Country, and Unsafe for this Town for many of them do often Swear that they will march away home."<sup>74</sup>

For men who volunteered to serve under a particular officer, the removal of that officer led to the threat of collective desertion. The volunteers Samuel Appleton led north from Newbury after the Destruction of Dover in 1689 fully expected to return with their commander. After briefly pursuing the Indians, they remained in garrison until the threat died down. Local leaders asked the Bay government for Appleton to remain because his company would not stay without him. Appleton assumed the pressed men would remain and the volunteers would leave with him, but their numbers were small compared to the volunteers and thus were vulnerable. Appleton needed orders to keep the pressed men on the frontier for apparently even they expected to leave when he did, and he suggested more soldiers be raised to replace his Newbury volunteers.<sup>75</sup>

Two years later, after the disastrous raid led by John March and Daniel King ended and the survivors posted on the frontier, New Hampshire community leaders reported that "we heare that there is great [murmuring] among the soldiers in the Garrisons for that both the Captains are going away, and

---

<sup>74</sup> "Joseph Prout to Isaac Addington, 1689," Baxter, ed., Doc. Hist. Me., Vol. V, 10-11. See Chapter Two.

<sup>75</sup> "Letter from William Vaughn and Richard Waldron, July 5, 1689," Baxter, ed., Doc. Hist. Me., Vol. IX, 9; "Letter from Major Samuel Appleton, July 14, 1689," Baxter, ed., Doc. Hist. Me., Vol. IX, 13.

many of them we are informed will not stay when their Chief Commanders are gone."<sup>76</sup> John March reported the soldiers and "likewis the wounded also very desirous of our staying there, and also Major Vahn and the Rest of the Gentelmen att the Esterne Parts." Daniel King had been persuaded to remain a few days longer, but the government needed to send "Some fitting person to take care of the Whole."<sup>77</sup>

The attachment between provincial officers and their men grew from a mutual respect which extended beyond the time spent in military service. Good officers inspired trust and affection and in turn, unlike their European counterparts, exhibited genuine respect and concern for their men. Of course, company level officers often had been privates themselves at some point, and their commands were likely to contain many relatives and neighbors, but even field grade provincial commanders never forgot that their soldiers were fellow citizens, and not, as one British officer said of his men, "a parcel of mercenary, fawning, lewd dissapated creatures, the dregs and scum of mankind."<sup>78</sup>

James Converse frequently supported former soldiers in their attempts to get aid from the provincial governments.<sup>79</sup>

---

<sup>76</sup> "Letter from William Vaughn and Richard Martyn to the Governor and Council, September 26, 1691," Baxter, ed., Doc. Hist. Me., Vol. V, 292-3.

<sup>77</sup> "Letter from John March to the Governor and Council, September, 27, 1691," Baxter, ed., Doc. Hist. Me., Vol. V, 293-4.

<sup>78</sup> Houlding, Fit for Service, 267.

<sup>79</sup> Baxter, ed., Doc. Hist. Me., Vol. V 432-3, 424-25.

His concern for the plight of soldiers and his willingness to assist them is reflected in a letter written to the Speaker of the House of Representatives on behalf of John Baker. "I cannot get off from the Old theam," wrote Converse, "Hear is A pcor Wounded Soldier, who had A trade and hous and land, and wherewith to live Comfortabley but hath spent all, and more, by Reason of A wound he Received in his Majesties' Service ... I know you love a soldier too well to see him Wronged, where it is in Your power to help. If your scife or any, desire to speak with me, about the matter, I will wait upon You on thirsaday next."<sup>80</sup>

The respect and affection between soldiers and officers also revealed itself in the reaction of men to the death of their commanders. When Winthrop Hilton's masting party was ambushed, one hundred men immediately volunteered to attempt a rescue and pursue the enemy. The Colonel's body was found and returned to Exeter for burial with "the several Troops in great Solemnity attending his Corps."<sup>81</sup> Benjamin Hassell's flight from Lovewell's final battle was obviously caused by the shock of seeing his commander fall. Hassell saw Lovewell hit on the first volley, and the death of his officer triggered his panic. Although he would indicate the company had been out-numbered and himself cut off by the

---

<sup>80</sup> "Letter by James Converse concerning a wounded soldier," Baxter, ed., *Doc. Hist. Me.*, Vol. IX, 98. For more on John Baker's problems see Chapter Eleven.

<sup>81</sup> Penhallow, *The History of the Wars of New England*, 58.

press of the Indians, Hassell's most vivid memory was "that he saw Captain Lovewell fall and heard him Groan."<sup>82</sup>

Of course, the ability of provincial officers to inspire their men received its severest test while under fire. John Keegan and Richard Holmes observed that for military leaders, the normal fear of death and of being a coward is "heightened by the knowledge that they have a status to maintain, and the realization that the lives of their subordinates hang upon their decisions."<sup>83</sup> The ability to survive such pressures depends upon an individual's personality and moral stamina. For some men the excitement and fear of combat enhances their martial qualities, while others break under the emotional weight. James Converse showed courage and strength under fire during the siege of Storer's garrison where he threatened to shoot anyone who suggested a surrender, and personally directed the fire of the soldiers and inhabitants.<sup>84</sup> When John Lovewell and his lieutenant fell at the first volley during the fight at Pequawket, the command fell on Ensign Seth Wyman who, in the words of Samuel Penhallow, "behaved himself with great Prudence and Courage, by animating the Men and telling them, 'That the Day would yet be their own, if their Spirits did not flag'; which enlivened them

---

<sup>82</sup> Baxter, ed., Doc. Hist. Me., Vol. X, 268-9, 270.

<sup>83</sup> John Keegan and Richard Holmes, Soldiers: A History of Men in Battle (New York, 1985), 261.

<sup>84</sup> For more on this action see Chapter on garrisons.

anew."<sup>85</sup> Wyman continued to direct the fight which lasted for several hours. But for others, such as Pasco Chubb who meekly surrendered Fort William Henry after a token resistance, courage failed at the crisis.<sup>86</sup>

For provincial officers, especially those on the company level or commanding raiding parties and patrols, leadership involved a physical presence as well as spiritual control. They were expected to be in the forefront of any action - physically leading their men in the fight.<sup>87</sup> John Lovewell's wounding by the Indian at the pond and his subsequent mortal wounding on the first volley fired by the main Indian party resulted from his presence at the head of his company. When the force commanded by John March and Daniel King ended their fruitless raid and embarked at Maquoit during the summer of 1691, the Indians fired on the remnants of the company remaining ashore. Captain Samuel Sherbourne was among the slain as he and several of the company officers felt their men should embark first.<sup>88</sup>

---

<sup>85</sup> Penhallow, The History of the Wars of New England, 114.

<sup>86</sup> See below for more on Pasco Chubb.

<sup>87</sup> Ranz Esbenshade indicated that New Hampshire provincial officers did not command in the formal sense but led by example because they were good shots, trackers and hunters. See "Sober, Modest Men of Confined Ideas," 57.

<sup>88</sup> Joseph Dow, History of the Town of Hampton, New Hampshire: From Its Settlement in 1638, to the Autumn of 1892 (Salem, MA, 1893 [reprinted, Somersworth, NH, 1970]), 227.

Benjamin Church emphasized the need for his physical presence at the head of his men. During his last raid in 1704, according to his recollections, the "ancient and unwieldy" sixty-five year old colonel had a Sergeant Edee boosting him over fallen trees. Church would "lay his breast against the tree, the said Edee turning him over, generally had catluck, falling on his feet, by which means [he] kept in the front" during a pursuit of some Indians.<sup>89</sup> Later in Nova Scotia, he divided his command into three sections, sending two around the flanks of the enemy force, while he drew the attention and the fire of the French on himself by standing in full view.<sup>90</sup>

The need to physically lead his men involved Church in an amusing episode during his 1691 raid into Maine, although it is probably only amusing in hindsight. During a rest in Casco Bay, Church allowed his Plymouth Indians to camp on shore where they were ambushed just before dawn by a large force of French Indians. Hugging the bank along the shore, the Plymouth Indians held off the enemy until Church could land his provincial soldiers. Church, assisted by James Converse, passed the word that he would give three shouts as a signal for an attack, and then, having shouted three times, he and Converse launched themselves up the bank and toward the enemy. However, Church's valiant charge ended abruptly when Converse announced that no one else had

---

<sup>89</sup> Church, The History of the Great Indian War, 269.

<sup>90</sup> Church, The History of the Great Indian War, 282.

followed them! The two officers hastily retreated back to the bank under heavy fire where they organized another assault and, this time followed by their men, drove the enemy away.<sup>91</sup>

Inspiring trust in their men and animating them to perform their duty often proved easier for provincial officers than maintaining a cordial working relationship with each other. The Louisbourg expedition proved to be especially straining in this regard. A Colonel Richmond seemed particularly adept at rubbing people the wrong way. On May 18, he placed Captain Daniel Ladd and his whole company under arrest because Ladd apparently marched by Richmond as he left the trenches without informing the colonel how many men he had. Ladd was so disgusted with Richmond that he refused to "order his men any more nor have anything to do with them."<sup>92</sup> On June 5, Samuel Rhodes complained to William Pepperrell that after his company had returned from a fatiguing scout, he was placed under the command of Richmond. "I have not the least inclination to be put under Coll. Richmond. A difference has happened between us ... which I resent and reflect upon with a just indignation, since I am a voluntier and a gentlemen." Rhodes asked Pepperrell to reconsider his assignment, indicating that "in case you don't ease me in this point I don't

---

<sup>91</sup> Church, The History of the Great Indian War, 193.

<sup>92</sup> "Joseph Sleepers Statement relative to the Trouble between Colonel Richmond and Captain Ladd at Louisbourg," Hammond, ed., NHSP, Vol. XVIII, 256-8.

care one farthing if the next minute I am shot through the head." If placed under Richmond's command Rhodes fully expected to see blunders and end up in trouble.<sup>93</sup>

Animosity and dissension also occurred occasionally between provincial officers and governors. After ordering Colonel Thomas Westbrook to conduct a raid along the Maine coast in August, 1724, Lt-Governor William Dummer fired off angry letters when Westbrook offered alternative plans and requested more soldiers. "Collo. Westbrooks Packet is enough to make one Sick," wrote Dummer to Secretary Willard, "what Hee has done allready as well as what Hee further insists on seems to tend directly to Confound our hopefull designes ... It was Impossible to express in more Strong termes My orders above all things that Hee should make no delay and yett Hee seems to have no Idea of it."<sup>94</sup> Westbrook soothed Dummer's temper by pointing out that his communication had been sent before he received Dummer's instructions, and that he had every intention of conducting the raid as soon as possible.<sup>95</sup>

---

<sup>93</sup> "Pepperrell Papers," Colls. Mass. Hist. Soc., Series VI, Vol. X, 259-60. See pages 271-3 for other examples of animosity between officers.

<sup>94</sup> "Lt-Governor Dummer to Secretary Willard, September 1, 1724," Baxter, ed., Doc. Hist. Me., Vol. X, 218-9.

<sup>95</sup> Baxter, ed., Doc. Hist. Me., Vol. X, 220. The raid was a disaster. Westbrook had only enough boats to transfer half his men at a time, the pilots proved inadequate, and the rivers were swollen by rain. Dummer's anger and the disastrous raid ended a particularly tiring campaign season for the frontier commander. Earlier in the summer, while preparing his men for the raid on Norridgewock, Westbrook had written a postscript in a



Difficulties between provincial officers and their English counterparts has been quite well documented. As Douglas Leach observed in Roots of Conflict, when provincial units were joined with the regular army, the provincials had to play by the regulars' rules.<sup>96</sup> English officers holding a royal commission believed the lowliest ensign outranked any provincial officer, and "the contempt and disgust so frequently expressed by the British officers inevitably were detected and resented by the provincials, especially those officers who had some regard for their own ability, experience, and worth."<sup>97</sup> In proposing his assault on Quebec in 1709, Samuel Vetch insisted that all problems of command - land vs. sea, provincial vs. regular - be settled before the expedition sailed.<sup>98</sup> Later as commander of Annapolis Royal with a combined garrison of provincials and Royal Marines, Vetch found that "what creates me a great deall of uneasiness is the multitude of officers of different Companys, whose jarrs about command and rank create me

---

letter to Dummer which said "I pray your Honours to excuse every thing amiss for I have been writing and dispatching orders from Son rise till Nine a Clock this night so that my brains is quite Addled." See Baxter, ed., Doc. Hist. Me., Vol. X, 216. See also Westbrooks reports on the raid, 221, 226.

<sup>96</sup> Leach, Roots of Conflict, 64.

<sup>97</sup> Leach, Roots of Conflict, 132.

<sup>98</sup> "Supplement to Vetch's Canada Proposal, Nov. 17, 1708," Calendar of State Papers, Colonial Series, America and West Indies, June, 1708-1709 (Reprint of 1922 edition, Vaduz, 1964), Vol. 24, No. 196.

... endless trouble, which the settlement of the garrison upon a regular footing would wholly prevent."<sup>99</sup>

Personality clashes and professional jealousies between officers became particularly debilitating when military enterprises were conducted by committee. Councils of war involving senior officers were common in eighteenth century armies, Phips held them in 1690 and Peter Warren and William Pepperrell met regularly during the siege of Louisbourg in 1745. But when one officer was unwilling, or unable, to take the final responsibility for a decision, chaos and usually defeat resulted. Benjamin Church's instructions for his 1690 raid included the order "to consult your council, the commanders or commission officers of your several companies, when it may be obtained, the greater part of whom to determine." When he later called a council of officers according to these orders, Church's plan to extend the raid was voted down because the other captains wanted to go home.<sup>100</sup> In 1704 Church used an officers' council vote to supersede orders from the Bay government.<sup>101</sup>

---

<sup>99</sup> "Samuel Vetch to Earl of Dartmouth, June 24, 1712," Calendar of State Papers, Colonial Series, America and West Indies, July, 1711-June, 1712 (Reprint of 1925 edition, Vaduz, 1964), Vol. 26, No. 457.

<sup>100</sup> Church, The History of the Great Indian War, 183, 191.

<sup>101</sup> Church, The History of the Great Indian War, 285. After extensive raiding around the Bay of Fundy, Church found orders to attack Norridgewock waiting for him at Falmouth. Since he believed the Indians were no longer there, and knew his men were tired and homesick, Church called a council of officers who voted to go home.

However, it was the Port Royal expedition of 1707 which best illustrates the disastrous consequences of councils of war. Two regiments were raised under the command of Francis Wainwright and Winthrop Hilton, and John March commanded over all. In addition, John Redknap, British military engineer for the colonies, accompanied the forces, as did Governor Joseph Dudley's son, William, in the capacity of Secretary of War.<sup>102</sup> The antagonism between the provincial officers and Redknap, backed by the Royal naval officers present, not to mention clashes between the provincial officers themselves, proved to be the undoing of the expedition. According to Samuel Penhallow, "A Council of War being called, it was resolv'd that the Artillery should be landed, and their lines forces: But thro' the Unfaithfulness of some, and cowardly Pretentions of others, little was done in annoying the Enemy ... if the Officers on board her Majesty's Ship had been true and faithful, matters had succeeded to good advantage. But instead of pressing on, they did rather clog and hinder the Affair: For by crafty Insinuations they afterward obtained a second Council, which the General not so well weighing as he ought, proved the overthrow of the whole Design."<sup>103</sup>

---

<sup>102</sup> Samuel Adams Drake, The Border Wars of New England. Commonly called King William's and Queen Anne's Wars (1897, reprint of 1910 edition, Williamstown, MA, 1973), 227.

<sup>103</sup> Penhallow, The History of the Wars of New England, 42.

March apparently was reluctant to proceed without the backing of the professional English officers, as he did not overrule the decision of the second "fatal council of war."<sup>104</sup> Governor Dudley was furious when he heard March had withdrawn the army, as were the citizens of Boston who taunted John Redknap and the other two officers sent to report the failure. Dudley decided that a second attempt should be made, and then compounded March's command problems by sending three civilian commissioners along with authority to overrule him. During the second siege John March broke down under the strain and turned the command over to Francis Wainwright. As the situation at Port Royal had changed very little, and in fact had worsened because the French had

---

<sup>104</sup> Drake, The Border Wars of New England, 232, quoting William Dudley. A chaplain with the expedition, John Barnard, met March just after the second council and reported the following exchange. "After the council-of-war was over, General March, meeting me, took me aside and said to me, 'Don't you smell a rat?' I, who knew not what he intended, said, 'No, sir.' 'Why,' said he, 'Colonel Appleton is for staying to break ground only to have his wages increased.' I said, 'Sir, I am a stranger to Colonel Appleton's intentions.' He then said to me, somewhat roughly, 'I have heard you have said the artillery might be brought' (and indeed I had said so to Colonel Appleton, and even projected a safe method for it). I said to him, 'Sir, I think it may.' 'Well then,' said he, 'it shall be attempted; you shall be the one to bring them up.' I replied, 'Sir, that is not my business, as you well know; however, if it will be of public service, and you please to command me to it, I will readily venture myself on it, and find a way to do it.' 'Very well,' said he." However, March did not command it and the army sailed for Casco Bay. See Drake, The Border Wars of New England, 230.

strengthened their position, Wainwright eventually withdrew his army.<sup>105</sup>

Despite a long and valued service against the French and Indians, which included the dogged defense of Falmouth during the massive Indian attack in August, 1703, John March would never again hold a provincial command.<sup>106</sup> His fate illustrates the consequences of failure for provincial officers -- oblivion. The governments of Northern New England and their citizens were quick to punish any perceived incompetence, cowardice or neglect on the part of their officers. While courts-martial were always a possibility, public censure proved to be the most common punishment.<sup>107</sup>

---

<sup>105</sup> Drake, The Border Wars of New England, 233-4; Penhallow, The History of the Wars of New England, 43-4; Belknap, History of New Hampshire, 174-5.

<sup>106</sup> At the age of thirty-three, March led a major raid in 1691 which, through no fault of his own, had ended disastrously. He commanded at Fort William Henry for a while, and later, after the defense of the fort at Falmouth, commanded the first major raiding force sent to Pequawket in Queen Anne's War. See Baxter, ed., Doc. Hist. Me., Vol. V, 277; Cotton Mather, Decennium Luctuosum (1699, reprinted in Charles H. Lincoln, ed., Narratives of the Indian Wars, 1675-1699, New York, 1913), 229; Penhallow, The History of the Wars of New England, 5-8. Thomas Hutchinson recorded that all the officers involved in Port Royal received some blame, but formal punishment of them all was impractical. "A court martial was judged necessary, and ordered, but never met. The act of the province, for the constituting courts martial, made so many officers requisite, that it was found impracticable to hold one. This must be owing to the great number of persons charged, the remainder be insufficient to try them." See Hutchinson, History of Massachusetts, 70.

<sup>107</sup> For example, the Reverend John Pike recorded in his journal that when the troopers were surprised at a garrison in Dunstable in July, 1706, resulting in a wild melee in a garrison in which several troopers were

In addition to the Port Royal expedition of 1707, the defeat at Quebec in 1690 and the loss of Fort William Henry in 1696 created the greatest outcry against the officers in command. While some blamed William Phips for the failure to capture the French capital, it was the commander of the land forces, John Walley, who faded from public service.<sup>108</sup>

---

killed but managed to drive the Indians away, the captain in command "was much blamed for not setting his sentinels out." See "Journal of Rev. John Pike," Mass. Hist. Soc. Proceedings, Vol. XIV (1875-76), 142. Even militia officer were not immune to censure if they failed in their responsibility to prepare their towns for defense. After the assault on Haverhill in 1697 which left forty dead or captured, it was "reported that Coll Saltingstall hath bin very negligent of his Duty as ... the said Coll Did not as he ought when he had notice of the enemies approach take care to Draw them into Garrison; nor incourage the persute of them when persons offered." An inquiry was demanded into the colonel's conduct. See "Vote in relation to Col. Saltonstall and Capt. Chubb, March, 1697," Baxter, ed., Doc. Hist. Me., Vol. V, 481-2.

- <sup>108</sup> Phips was blamed for wasting his precious powder supplies on a futile naval bombardment of the city. For example, historian Richard Johnson wrote that Phip's "squandered [the] fleet's supply of powder in vain bombardment of the city's craggy walls." See Richard R. Johnson, Adjustment to Empire: The New England Colonies, 1675-1715 (New Brunswick, NJ, 1981), 196. But the artillery fire was meant to be in support of a simultaneous land assault. It is reported that Phips saw the flags of the provincial forces at the river crossing where they were to begin their attack, and thus commenced his bombardment. However, Walley did not press the attack. This same strategy was later suggested by Peter Warren as a way to reduce Louisbourg. He proposed to sail his ships into the harbor with guns blazing while Pepperrell's men assaulted the walls. Pepperrell's men refused to participate, preferring to give the siege tactics a chance to work.

It is probably just as well for the provincial soldiers that Walley lost his nerve. The strategy may have worked against a surprised and weak town, but the arrival of Frontenac and reinforcements from Montreal meant the French actually outnumbered Walley's men. Phip's plan was defeated the moment Frontenac found he

Walley seemed to lose his nerve once he and his soldiers were ashore. When the New Englanders pushed back the French forces sent to oppose or harass the landing, many expected Walley to order an immediate assault on the town. But time passed with no command, and the adrenaline of the provincial soldiers began to dissipate.

The Reverend John Wise searched for Walley throughout the army and finally found him in an obviously depressed state. Wise asked him what he was doing and Walley replied, "I cannot rule them. To Whom I replied sir you must not expect when men are let loose upon an Enemie that they should attend all the Ceremonies martail and that are in fashion in a field of Peace But Sir said I what do you intend to doe he replied I think they intend to lodge here all Night." Wise urged an immediate attack because the men were "Warne by to Morrow they will Stiffen and Coole." The attack never occurred, and Wise later found Walley wandering about "swallowed up with thoughts which I can deem from first to last to be only the Invincible Arrest of fear."<sup>109</sup> Walley paralysis was noticed by others as well. As one anonymous participant concluded "but what is an army of

---

was not pinned down at Montreal. For a criticism of Phips see Francis Parkman, Count Frontenac and New France under Louis XIV (Boston, 1896), 270-9.

<sup>109</sup> "Narrative of Mr. John Wise," Mass. Hist. Soc. Proceedings, Vol. XV, 289-90.

Lyons when they must not go on Except a frightened Hart shall lead them?"<sup>110</sup>

However, no officer had more contempt heaped upon him than the man who surrendered Fort William Henry to the French in 1696 -- Pasco Chubb. A citizen of Andover, Massachusetts, Chubb had served on the Maine frontier for several years leading patrol and raiding parties before ordered to relieve John March as commander of the provincial fort at Pemaquid.<sup>111</sup> In February, 1696, several prominent Indian chiefs approached the fort to parley for the exchange of prisoners. According to Cotton Mather, during the meeting outside the fort "Chub found an Opportunity, in a pretty Chubbed manner, to kill the famous Edgeremett, and Abenquid, a couple of Principal Sagamores, with one or Two other Indians."<sup>112</sup> Later that summer Fort William Henry was invested by several hundred French and Indians with naval support and artillery. Chubb initially put up a brave front,<sup>113</sup> but fearing what the Indians would do to him and his command because of the incident in February, "Chub, with

---

<sup>110</sup> Anon, "Phips Expedition to Canada," Mass. Hist. Soc. Proceedings, Vol. XV, 315.

<sup>111</sup> For Chubb's earlier service, see "Capt. Pasco Chubb and Lieut. Brackett to Lieut. Gov. Stoughton, August 31, 1695," Baxter, ed., Doc. Hist. Me., Vol. V, 426-7; "Major Charles Frost to Lieut. Gov. Stoughton, September 21, 1695," Baxter, ed., Doc. Hist. Me., Vol. V, 431-2.

<sup>112</sup> Mather, Decennium Luctuosum, in Lincoln, ed., Narratives of the Indian Wars, 261.

<sup>113</sup> For details see Chapter Three.



an unaccountable Baseness, did Surrender the Brave Fort at Pemmaquid into their Hands."<sup>114</sup>

On his return to Boston Chubb was thrown in jail to await a court-martial. On November 18, he petitioned the Bay government to be either tried or given bail "whereby he may be inabled to take Some care of his poore family." Chubb described himself as "avery pocre man, haveing a wife and children to Looke after which by reason of his confinement and poverty are reduced to a meane and necessitous Condition, haveing not wherewithall either to defray his prison necessary charges or to releive his Indigent family."<sup>115</sup> However, Chubb was not released and sat in jail throughout the winter. In March a vote was taken in the House of Representatives "that Capt. Chub, who hath Long Laid in prison may be Brought to his Tryall: the negglect whereof is agreivance."<sup>116</sup> Chubb was never brought to trial, and was released that spring to live quietly in Andover. Less than a year later, in February, 1698, the Indians killed both Chubb and his wife, apparently in revenge for his treachery two years before.<sup>117</sup>

---

<sup>114</sup> Mather, Decennium Luctuosum, in Lincoln, ed., Narratives of the Indian Wars, 262. To give Chubb the benefit of the doubt, both Thomas Hutchison and Francis Parkman believed he could not have held the fort against such overwhelming odds. See Hutchinson, History of Massachusetts, 70; Parkman, Count Frontenac, 381.

<sup>115</sup> Baxter, ed., Doc. Hist. Me., Vol. V, 469-70.

<sup>116</sup> Baxter, ed., Doc. Hist. Me., Vol. V, 481-2.

<sup>117</sup> Drake, The Border Wars of New England, 134.

The military theorist Carl von Clausewitz wrote that "there have been many instances of men who have shown the greatest resolution in an inferior rank, and have lost it in a higher position. While, on the one hand, they are obliged to resolve, on the other they see the dangers of a wrong decision, and as they are surrounded with things new to them, their understanding loses its original force, and they become only the more timid the more they become aware of the danger of the irresolution into which they have fallen, and the more they have formerly been in the habit of acting on the spur of the moment."<sup>118</sup> Such was certainly the situations of John March and John Walley, and even Pasco Chubb. Placed in positions beyond their capabilities, their insecurity and indecision led to defeat. As Samuel Penhallow said of March, "he was a Man of good Courage, and a true lover of his Country. But the Business that he undertook, was too weighty for his Shoulders to bear."<sup>119</sup> The consequence of their personal failure was an ignominious end to a public career.

While quick to condemn incompetence, New Englanders were just as eager to reward success. Military advancement, high militia rank and positions in government came to many officers who proved their competence in the field. Ranz Esbenshade found that while only ten percent of New Hamp-

---

<sup>118</sup> Carl von Clausewitz, On War (1832; Penguin reprint, 1985), 143.

<sup>119</sup> Penhallow, The History of the Wars of New England, 43.

shire's company level officers held political office before their service, sixty-five percent attained it after.<sup>120</sup> For taking command after Lovewell's death and leading the company in their day long battle, Ensign Seth Wyman was made a captain and given a silver sword.<sup>121</sup> Commodore Charles Knowles presented Phineas Stevens with a sword for his defense of the fort at Number Four in 1747.<sup>122</sup>

Benjamin Church rose to the rank of Lt-Colonel of militia, and for his 1704 raid the Assembly of Massachusetts "voted him Thanks for the good Services he did both to the Queen and Country."<sup>123</sup> And after his service in King William's War, James Converse also became Lt-Colonel of militia, and in March, 1703 was selected as Speaker of the House of Representatives. Later that summer Converse would be placed in command of all forces in the field.<sup>124</sup>

---

<sup>120</sup> Esbenschade, "Sober, Modest Men of Confined Ideas," 52.

<sup>121</sup> Penhallow, The History of the Wars of New England, 117. Wyman had little time to enjoy his fame and success. He fell ill and died while on a scout a few months later.

<sup>122</sup> Herbert Milton Sylvester, Indian Wars of New England (Boston, 1910), Vol. III, 380-3. The town which grew up around the fort was named Charlestown to commemorate the gift.

<sup>123</sup> "Governor Joseph Dudley to the Earl of Nottingham, December 10, 1702," Calendar of State Papers, Colonial Series, America and West Indies, December 1, 1702-1703 (Reprint of 1913 edition, Vaduz, 1964), Vol. 21, No. 30; Penhallow, The History of the Wars of New England, 19. The vote was not without opposition, however, as some felt the results of the raid left much to be desired.

<sup>124</sup> "Governor Joseph Dudley to the Earl of Nottingham, December 10, 1702," Calendar of State Papers, Vol. 21,

However, one negative aspect of military success was the potentially deadly attention of the Eastern Indians, who knew the English commanders and where they lived. A Frenchman captured after the attack on Salmon Falls in 1689 confessed that "their design was not against this place ... but principally against Monsuir Tyng and the place where he lived."<sup>125</sup> Major Charles Frost of Kittery, Maine, who commanded all the provincial soldiers on the eastern frontier after January, 1695, was ambushed in 1697 as he walked home from church. According to local legend the Indians opened Frost's grave the night after his burial, carried his body to the top of Frost's Hill and tied it to a

---

No. 30; "Minutes of the Massachusetts Council, March 11, 1703," Calendar of State Papers, Vol. 21, No. 433; "Minutes of the Massachusetts Council, September 13, 1703," Calendar of State Papers, Vol. 21, No. 1087. The rewards to Church and Converse were not always so forthcoming. After their service on the frontier in 1690, which included among other things their solo charge against the enemy (see above), the Bay government was too impoverished by the Quebec expedition to pay them. Church related the story of these two warriors meeting in a tavern and between the two of them not having enough money to buy a parting drink. Church's brother even had to send him a horse so he could get home. See Church, The History of the Great Indian War, 197.

- <sup>125</sup> "French Captive Examination from Piscataway Co., March 19, 1689/90" Baxter, ed., Doc. Hist. Me., Vol. V, 55-56. The Frenchman's interrogators were unclear if he meant Tyng of Merrimack river or Tyng of Casco Bay. The Tyngs of Dunstable had many men in provincial service. One who fell to the enemy in 1710 was Captain John Tyng, according to Samuel Adams Drake "one of the best and bravest partisan leaders." Drake, The Border Wars of New England, 264. See also Hutchinson, History of Massachusetts, 106.

stake.<sup>126</sup> Jeremy Belknap wrote that Winthrop Hilton "was so brave and active an officer that the enemy had marked him for destruction; and for this purpose a party of them kept lurking about his house." In 1706 the Indians attacked a party going to mow a field because they believed Hilton was among them.<sup>127</sup> When Hilton was eventually killed while masting in the summer of 1710, the Indians "with utmost revenge struck their Hatchets in his Brains, leaving a Lance in his Heart."<sup>128</sup>

Provincial officers were not "subservient to the wishes of their men,"<sup>129</sup> nor did they rely on "coaxing and wheedling" to command.<sup>130</sup> Provincial soldiers entrusted their lives to an officer, and his ability and reputation were very much a factor in their decision to enlist. In his study of New Hampshire officers, Ranz Esbenshade concluded

---

<sup>126</sup> "Petition of Charles Frost, May 27, 1696," Baxter, ed., Doc. Hist. Me., Vol. V, 434; Everett S. Stackpole, Old Kittery and her Families (Lewiston, ME, 1903), 168. As this is the only account of Indians desecrating a grave during the early French wars, its veracity may be suspect.

<sup>127</sup> Belknap, History of New Hampshire, 172, 178. A similar case of mistaken identity apparently occurred in April, 1723, when the Indians mistook a provincial sergeant for Johnson Harmon. Fifteen muskets were fired at the sergeant who was struck by eleven of the balls. - Hutchinson, History of Massachusetts, 229.

<sup>128</sup> Penhallow, The History of the Wars of New England, 59; Drake, The Border Wars of New England, 263; Potter, The Military History of New Hampshire, 32-33.

<sup>129</sup> Hamilton, The French and Indian Wars, 93.

<sup>130</sup> Elting, American Army Life, 9.

that "instead of ~~commanding~~ platoons of well-drilled riff-raff, the provincial officers led groups of fellow citizens." Those fellow citizens had little patience with incompetence. In describing the qualities of a military leader, Clausewitz wrote that "if we take a general view of the four elements composing the atmosphere in which War moves, of *danger, physical effort, uncertainty, and chance*, it is easy to conceive that a great force of mind and understanding is requisite to be able to make way with safety and success amongst such opposing elements, a force which ... we find termed by military writers and annalists as *energy, firmness, staunchness, strength of mind and character*."<sup>131</sup> In most cases provincial soldiers tried to follow men with such qualities. Those possessing them had little need for strict discipline to control their men.

---

<sup>131</sup> Clausewitz, On War, 144.

## CHAPTER NINE

### BATTLE DRILL AND FIGHTING SPIRIT

Richard Holmes recently wrote that military training "has two clearly identifiable functions. Its most obvious task is to instill exactly what its name suggests, an adequate level of training in such things as weapon handling and minor tactics. Its second, though by no means less important, function is to inculcate the military ethos in recruits."<sup>1</sup> The soldier must undergo training to learn the tactics and techniques which will enable him to function under fire, to use his weapons properly and to understand and obey orders, often referred to as "battle drill". The soldier must also learn to overcome the instinctive urge for self-preservation and subordinate his individualism to the needs of his tactical unit, as well as prepare himself for the stress of combat. Constant repetition, the emphasis on "spit and polish" and the use of close order drill in modern basic training are only a few of the techniques used to build morale and make recruits "feel like soldiers".<sup>2</sup> From

---

<sup>1</sup> Richard Holmes, Acts of War: The Behavior of Men in Battle (New York, 1985), 36.

<sup>2</sup> Holmes, Acts of War, 41-43.

Spartan phalanx to modern rifle company, training has been the forge which welded a single tactical unit from its disparate individual members.

Ostensibly, it is a deficiency in such training which has contributed so much to the tarnished image of the New England provincial soldier. "Haphazardly trained and poorly disciplined" during infrequent frolics called "training day," provincial soldiers, unlike their professional European counterparts, could not hope to cope with the increasing complexities of eighteenth century warfare.<sup>3</sup> However, battle drill, the first function of military training, must prepare the soldier for the type of combat he will encounter or it serves no purpose, and can even be counter-productive. The Spartan would have found twentieth century training techniques, beyond the physical fitness benefits, of little use to him in learning to handle shield and spear, and obviously, the employment of Spartan tactics on the modern battlefield would be suicidal. Similarly, the type of training and discipline usually indicated as deficient in provincial soldiers prepared them for a kind of combat they never experienced, and an increase in such training would have been superfluous, even dangerous.

In addition, while the second function of intense training is to forge the fighting spirit which carries a soldier through the stress of battle, it can exist without

---

<sup>3</sup> Lawrence Delbert Cress, Citizens in Arms: The Army and Militia in American Society to the War of 1812 (Chapel Hill, NC, 1982), 8.



such discipline. As Carl von Clausewitz observed, "a certain plodding earnestness and strict discipline may keep up military virtue for a long time, but can never create it; these things therefore have a certain value, but must not be overrated. ... Beware then of confusing the *spirit* of an Army with its temper."<sup>4</sup>

The most prominent source of military training for Provincial soldiers, and the one most often used to illustrate the inadequacy of the provincial military system, were the periodic militia training days. By the beginning of the French wars militia officers in northern New England were mandated by law to muster their companies "four dayes annually, and no more, to exercise them in motions, the use of arms, and shooting at marks, or other military exercises," with regimental musters to be held once every three years.<sup>5</sup> The infrequency of training recognized the endless occupational and familial demands on citizen soldiers, as when the Royal Government, concerned with the economic livelihood of its colony of New Hampshire, admonished the governor that "neither frequency nor unreasonableness of remote Marches, Musters and Traynings be an unnecessary Impediment to the affairs of the planters."<sup>6</sup>

---

<sup>4</sup> Carl von Clausewitz, On War (orig. published 1832; Viking Penguin, Inc., New York, 1985), 258.

<sup>5</sup> "An Act for Regulating of the Militia, Nov. 22, 1693," in Background of Selective Service, Vol II (Washington, 1947), Massachusetts Militia Laws, 139.

<sup>6</sup> "Instructions to the Governor, 1682," New Hampshire Militia Laws, Background of Selective Service, 5.

While recognizing the militia training day as an important social node for early American communities, historians have concluded that any actual military value was negated both by their sporadic nature and the tendency for them to rapidly disintegrate from military drill to holiday frolic. Despite the obvious presence of danger during the Indian wars of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, New Englanders had to be constantly reminded of the serious purpose behind the training days. Cotton Mather warned members of the militia that they should not look on training day as a time of diversion and recreation, or for sitting around smoking,<sup>7</sup> and in 1679 laws were passed to prevent the sale and use of strong drink because the soldiers "committ many disorders of drunkenness, fighting, neglect of duty, &c."<sup>8</sup> In addition to the extracurricular activities just

---

<sup>7</sup> Cotton Mather, Military Duties Recommended to an Artillery Company, 1687 (Boston, 1687), 23.

<sup>8</sup> Massachusetts Militia Laws, Background of Selective Service, 125. Militia training days changed very little over the course of two centuries. One account of a militia training day in York, Maine around 1830 indicated that the "military display on that occasion was of itself a curious spectacle: -- fantastic companies in rag-tag-and-bob-tail uniforms, -- no two alike with ... arms of every conceivable shape and form. Leaving out the debauches, gaming, riots, tumults and the like, there were exhibitions of buffoonery, wax-works, Jim Crow dancing, ...[and] the sale of confectionery and molasses gingerbread. Among the numerous divertisements of the day we may make mention of a sham fight, then thought a necessary adjunct to the completion of a full performance on a training day ... [after deciding on who would play the part of dead and wounded] the two lines then approached each other, the mimic combat began, and soon the ground was thickly covered with the victims of war's fell

listed, militia members looked forward to concluding training day with a mock battle whenever powder supplies permitted. According to historian Morrison Sharp militia officers loved the "pageantry of roar and shout and gay color of a regimental muster," especially the sham fight.<sup>9</sup> Near the end of King Philip's War, Richard Waldron of Dover, New Hampshire captured two hundred Indians by involving them in such a simulated battle "after the English fashion", except that Waldron's men were not shamming, and this "treachery" made him a target for Indian vengeance in 1689.<sup>10</sup>

However, in spite of the holiday atmosphere, or perhaps in some cases because of it, attendance at militia training days could be dismal. "I can't spare the time to train" and "There are enough to train without me" were familiar excuses offered by truant members of the militia.<sup>11</sup> Colonial Assemblies attempted to force attendance at training day through the imposition of fines. Applied toward the purchase of much needed equipment for their company, the busy, indifferent or wealthy militiaman could actually make a contribution

---

rage." See Charles Edward Banks, History of York, Maine (Boston, 1931-35), Vol. II, 218-19.

<sup>9</sup> Morrison Sharp, "Leadership and Democracy in the Early New England System of Defense," American Historical Review, 5 (1945), 253.

<sup>10</sup> Samuel Adams Drake, The Border Wars of New England, Commonly called King William's and Queen Anne's Wars (1897, reprint of 1910 edition, Williamstown, MA, 1973), 16.

<sup>11</sup> Mather, Military Duties, 20.

to his company by skipping training and paying such a fine.<sup>12</sup> If the fine was not paid, however, the individual could be laid neck and heels or made to ride the wooden horse for up to an hour at the next muster he attended.<sup>13</sup> Although fines were increased throughout the period, absenteeism at militia training would remain chronic.

Like the militia organization itself, training day served mainly an administrative purpose. Four times each year, according to statutes, the clerk of individual militia companies were to "take an exact list of all persons living within the precincts" who qualified for the militia, and it was probably not coincidental that these same companies were ordered to train four times a year, thus providing the clerks a convenient opportunity to make out their lists.<sup>14</sup> In addition, officers were instructed to biannually "give order for a diligent enquiry into the state of [their] company ... of the defects of arms or otherwise."<sup>15</sup> They were then ordered by law to drill their men in "motions, the use of arms ...or other military exercises." However,

---

<sup>12</sup> Douglas Edward Leach, Arms for Empire: A Military History of the British Colonies in North America, 1607-1763 (New York, 1973), 20-21.

<sup>13</sup> "An Act for Regulating of the Militia, Nov. 22, 1693," Massachusetts Militia Laws, Background of Selective Service, 139.

<sup>14</sup> "An Act for Regulating of the Militia, Nov. 22, 1693," Massachusetts Militia Laws, Background of Selective Service, 138.

<sup>15</sup> "An Act for Regulating of the Militia, Nov. 22, 1693," Massachusetts Militia Laws, Background of Selective Service, 140

allowing time for the men to arrive in the morning, calling the roll and correcting the muster list, inspecting arms and equipment, eating, and the all-important mock battle left precious little opportunity for actual drill and training, training which would in theory have made them better equipped for their military duties.

Yet for most types of service the militia training day served as all the formal military preparation provincial soldiers received. Garrison duty left them too scattered to drill effectively, and soldiers stationed in forts spent most of their time on sentry duty, scouting, and repairing the structure.<sup>16</sup> Patrols and raids were initiated as soon as the forces were assembled, both to increase the opportunity for surprise and decrease the cost to the province. Only expeditions granted the opportunity for advanced training in the military discipline before soldiers entered combat, but such training often proved unnecessary, or less an instrument of education than a cure for idleness.

The troops assembled for the aborted attack on Quebec in 1709 received so much training through the summer that Samuel Vetch informed the Earl of Sunderland that "I can now without the least boast assure your Lordships that they both do the manuell exercise and fire in platoons and battalions equall to most regiments in the service."<sup>17</sup> But colonial

---

<sup>16</sup> see chapter two

<sup>17</sup> "Samuel Vetch to the Earl of Sunderland, Aug. 2 & 12, 1709," Calendar of State Papers, Colonial Series.

leaders had fully expected to embark their soldiers the minute they were assembled, so any subsequent training was simply a by-product of the British failure to arrive. A few years later the provincials involved in the Louisbourg expedition spent a month at Canso drilling in preparation for the assault on the French fortress, but the month delay was caused not by the need to train the troops but the presence of ice around the island of Cape Breton. William Pepperrell reported that he kept the men drilling for their "health and spirits" as much as any improvements in their discipline.<sup>18</sup>

The infrequency of training, the holiday atmosphere and the chronic absenteeism created the impression that provincial soldiers were unprepared for war, that they were wanting in discipline and drill -- discipline, which in the eyes of British officials and many subsequent historians, would have brought the provincials closer to the European ideal. A sampling of historical interpretation underscores the opinion that provincial soldiers were inferior to their European counterparts because they lacked proper training. American units "generally suffered from low morale and slack discipline,"<sup>19</sup> therefore, the most "important fighting [was]

---

America and West Indies, June, 1708-1709 (Reprint of 1922 edition, Vaduz, 1964), Vol. 24, No. 666.

<sup>18</sup> "William Pepperrell to Governor Shirley, April 28, 1745" Collections of the Massachusetts Historical Society, Vol I, 22.

<sup>19</sup> John Shy, "A New Look at Colonial Militia," in A People Numerous and Armed: Reflections on the Military Struggle for American Independence (London, 1976), 31.

done by European troops ... [because] American troops in general lacked discipline and training in European tactics."<sup>20</sup> Indeed, the "superiority of regulars was repeatedly demonstrated."<sup>21</sup> But what kind of training were they lacking? Was the European ideal necessary for the provincial soldier? or even wise? Would increased training have made them better equipped for war?

As indicated earlier, the purpose of military training is to prepare the soldier for combat, and so it is necessary to understand the nature of that combat, and what the common soldier needed to know to function properly, in order to evaluate the efficiency of any training program. There were three main categories of land warfare in the early eighteenth century - the linear tactic battle, the siege and *petite guerre*. The linear tactics of the eighteenth century developed initially during the religious wars of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries when pikemen and musketeers were welded together in mutually supporting roles on the battlefield, the muskets providing long-range missile combat and the pike close-range shock and defensive capabilities. But by the close of the seventeenth century improvements in firearms and the introduction of the bayonet merged

---

<sup>20</sup> Harold L. Peterson, Arms and Armor in Colonial America, 1526-1783 (Harrisburg, PA, 1956), 155.

<sup>21</sup> Howard H. Peckham, The Colonial Wars, 1689-1762 (Chicago, 1964), 214.

the two roles of pikeman and musketeer.<sup>22</sup> The increased reliability of the flintlock musket gradually shifted emphasis from close combat (the "push of pike") to fire combat so that, even with the flexibility offered by the bayonet, it became increasingly rare for armies to close within the range of cold steel.<sup>23</sup>

Tacticians found that the most effective way to employ the fire power of the smoothbore muskets was to lay down volleys against the enemy. The term "volley" should not be construed to mean mass firing by whole battalions, but rather controlled fire by smaller tactical units. For example, in the early eighteenth century the British used a system called "platoon fire." The battalion was divided into eighteen platoons and six of these, distributed evenly along the line, would fire together. By the time the third group of platoons had fired, the first would have reloaded thus providing, theoretically at least, a continuous fire. In such a system firing had to be very controlled and by command only.<sup>24</sup> In addition to loading and firing on

---

<sup>22</sup> John Keegan and Richard Holmes, Soldiers: A History of Men in Battle (New York, 1985), 27.

<sup>23</sup> J. A. Houlding, Fit for Service: The Training of the British Army, 1715-95 (Oxford, 1981), 261.

<sup>24</sup> Houlding, Fit For Service, 318; The confusion of battle could easily destroy the precision of such firing. Houlding related an incident during the battle of Dettingin where a junior officer inquired whether he should have the men firing by platoons, and was told by his colonel that he was free to try, but the colonel had never known it to happen. The British would switch to a simpler version of platoon fire, called "alternate fire" later in the eighteenth century.



command, the soldier had to master the marching maneuvers which enabled the battalion to cross the battlefield to an effective killing range.<sup>25</sup> The battalion would be required to change from column to line, move around obstacles and compensate for casualties, plus be prepared to assume special formations designed to repel an attack by cavalry or other threats, all the while maintaining the close formation required for effective firing.

In contrast, siege warfare, as has been noted in an earlier chapter, was the warfare of the engineer and required very little technical knowledge on the part of the common soldier. For him siege warfare was a war of shovel, pick and axe. Drafted to help the sappers move the artillery closer to the wall, Soldiers dug protecting trenches, or made wicker baskets called "gabions" which, when filled with dirt, lined the top of the trenches. In addition, they tied brush into bundles called "fascines" which could be used by attacking forces to fill any holes or ditches close to the wall.<sup>26</sup> When the artillery was close

---

<sup>25</sup> Effective killing range in the eighteenth century was 75 to 150 yards. Several countries performed tests to determine the effectiveness. A Prussian battalion firing at a target six feet high and one hundred feet high produced hits of 40% at 150 yards and 60% at 75 yards. A similar test performed by the Norfolk militia in England firing at a target two feet by eighty feet (raised on poles to represent the upper part of the body only) only 70 yards away scored hits of 20%, and this convinced the colonel that his men shot very well! - Houlding, Fit for Service, 262-3; Keegan and Holmes, Soldiers, 66.

<sup>26</sup> for example, provincial forces at Cartagena carried fascines as well as ladders for use by the British

enough, they attempted to batter a hole in the main wall of the fortress called a "breach", the debris from the hole falling into the ditch in front to form a rough ramp for the attacking infantry. Normally the fortress would seek terms of surrender at this point, but if an assault became necessary it was generally made at night, where the darkness and the rough climb over the debris ramp precluded any attempt at formation. "Into the Breach" meant a wild scramble over broken stone and masonry in darkness under heavy fire. Under such circumstances victory for the assaulting troops traditionally included the privilege of sacking the town or fortress for three days.<sup>27</sup> Obviously, sieges did not involve linear tactics. Only when an enemy force attempted to lift the siege from the outside might a besieging army actually fight a linear tactic battle, unless, of course, the enemy employed the third form of combat in its attempt to lift the siege -- *petite guerre*.

*Petite guerre*, or "little war", as it developed in the New World involved combat which was, as Cotton Mather wrote, "what your Artists at Fighting do call, *A la disbanded* (Spanish for 'separately, not in company formation.')." <sup>28</sup> Soldiers fought with wide spaces between them, what contemporary military theorists called "extended order", as at the battle of Casco, Maine in 1689, when Benjamin Church ordered

<sup>27</sup> Keegan and Holmes, *Soldiers*, 104-5, 167-72.

<sup>28</sup> Cotton Mather, *Decennium Luctuosum* (1699, reprinted in Charles H. Lincoln, ed., *Narratives of the Indian Wars, 1675-1699*, New York, 1913), 223.

his combined force of Indians and whites to march "very thin" when approaching the enemy.<sup>29</sup> Although on occasion firing was by volley (especially when a surprise attack was attempted),<sup>30</sup> once a battle developed soldiers found cover and fired when they saw a target. The scope of the battlefield and the combatants in *petite guerre* was small and the tactics simple.

Of the three types of combat, linear tactics required the most extensive training. It demanded soldiers act as one and act only on command. "Constant repetition of the basic drill movements," observed John Keegan and Richard Holmes, "was designed to ensure that the soldier could load and fire his weapon and master a number of tactical formations. Proficiency in drill gave soldiers a real advantage on the battlefield: they could fire faster and move more efficiently than their opponents ... many drill movements would have been repeated till they had become conditioned

---

<sup>29</sup> Thomas Church, The History of the Great Indian War of 1675 and 1676 Commonly called Philip's War, also, The Old French and Indian Wars, from 1689 to 1704 (Hartford, Conn, 1845 edition, orig. pub. 1716), 168.

<sup>30</sup> In 1725, when his scouting force discovered ten sleeping Indians, John Lovewell divided his men into firing parties of five and had them fire successive volleys into the Indian camp. Similarly, the soldiers who destroyed Norridgewock the previous summer were ordered to withhold their fire until the Indians had discharged their weapons first. See Jeremy Belknap, The History of New Hampshire (Reprint of 1831 edition, New York, 1970), 208; Fannie Eckstorm, "The Attack on Norridgewock: 1724," New England Quarterly, (1934), 568.

reflexes."<sup>31</sup> In his study of the training of the British army in the eighteenth century, J. A. Houlding identified five phases in the instruction of the redcoat. Phase one involved the "manual exercise" - the long, slow sequence in which a recruit learned to load and fire his musket, carry it on the march, and perform ceremonial movements. Once he had mastered loading his musket, he moved on to phase two, or the "platoon exercises" which featured the firing of volleys. "Evolutions" covered very basic marching commands including rank and file movements, facing, open and closing ranks, etc..

From these first three phases the soldier learned "the use of his weapons, the ability to move in regulated way, and a docile obedience,"<sup>32</sup> and the soldier put them to use in the last two phases of his training, "firings" (platoon firing, firing advancing, retreating and on the spot) and "maneuvers" (the linear movements of the battlefield on a battalion level). Both of these involved officers more than the men as they were required give the commands to fire at the correct time, or order their platoon or sub-division to perform some maneuver which would accomplish the grand maneuver of the battalion.<sup>33</sup> Linear tactics demanded

---

<sup>31</sup> Keegan and Holmes, Soldiers, 43.

<sup>32</sup> Houlding, Fit for Service, 161.

<sup>33</sup> For example, if the battalion wanted to form a column of sub-divisions from the line formation, each sub-division commander would have to give the command to wheel at the correct time, the common soldier would

coordination and absolute, unquestioning obedience, and Houlding, echoing Keegan and Holmes, found that the life of the British soldier consisted of "endless drill -- to the end that the skills acquired [as a recruit] should through constant mechanical repetition be honed to a level of perfection verging on the conditioned reflex."<sup>34</sup> However, a high influx of recruits, or the common dispersal of the battalion in peacetime could reduce the efficiency of a British regiment to the point where it would take years to make it fit for service again.<sup>35</sup>

In addition to drill and combat experience, British officers relied on printed manuals to understand the complicated commands associated with linear tactics, and the manuals used by provincial or militia officers throughout the early French wars were either reprints or compilations of these British military instructions. Published in 1690, An Abridgement of the English Military Discipline contains little more than the manual exercise for loading and firing the musket, as well as the coordination of pikes and musketeers and the exercise for grenadiers. Twenty-six commands and motions were required for the soldier to load his musket, and the use of matchlocks and bandoleers with wooden

---

only have to know how to wheel, not the ultimate reason for it.

<sup>34</sup> Houlding, Fit for Service, 266.

<sup>35</sup> With the battalion dispersed in garrisons, the officers had no opportunity to practise the higher levels of firings and marching maneuvers. See Houlding, Fit for Service, 93.

chargers are indicated by such commands as "Blow off your loose corns"<sup>36</sup>, "Handle your chargers", "Open them with your teeth", etc.<sup>37</sup> Such elaborate commands can be confusing to the modern historian who imagine that soldiers went through such long procedures at all times, but this exercise was designed to teach ignorant English farm boys, who had never handled a weapon, how to load and fire.<sup>38</sup> The very specific

---

<sup>36</sup> This commands refers to the necessity to blow away any loose "corns" of powder after filling the pan so the lighted match in a matchlock could not accidentally fire the weapon.

<sup>37</sup> An Abridgement of the English Military Discipline (Boston, 1690), 10-11.

<sup>38</sup> The eighteenth century British military writer, Bennett Cuthbertson, recommended that "as soon as a Recruit is master of all the motions in the Manual and Platoon-Exercise, he must be trained to the use of Powder, to which most of them have at first that aversion, which may reasonably be expected in ignorant unexperienced peasants, whose heads are filled with the most dreadful apprehensions of its effects, from the stories told them out of fun, by the old Soldiers: it requires some practice to get the better of this dislike, and to prevail on them to load with coolness." (Bennett Cuthbertson, A System for the Compleat Interior Management and Economy of a Battalion of Infantry (Dublin, 1768), 163.) One quote from the Louisbourg campaign has been frequently misinterpreted as proof of the general ignorance of New Englanders in military matters. John Ferling employed the quote when he observed that provincial soldiers "were often even less prepared for war than their leaders. Enroute to Canada in 1745, ill-prepared New Hampshire soldiers 'were Ordered Ashore ... and Taught How to Use the firelock.'" (John Ferling, A Wilderness of Miseries: War and Warriors in Early America (Westport, Conn, 1980), 22) Provincial soldiers were familiar with both the effects of powder and the basics of loading a firearm. What the observer was referring to was this long-loading sequence featured in all the military manuals of the period, and nothing more. The New Hampshire troops were brought on shore and drilled in order to give them something to do.

commands not only left nothing to chance in the instruction, but instilled a rhythm in the loading and firing consistent with the principle of controlled volley fire. During battle, when speed was essential, the number of commands was reduced drastically and the soldier performed many of the tasks automatically, but with a rate consistent with the rest of his platoon.

The loading commands in An Abridgement were reproduced exactly, even the same type face, in Nicholas Boone's Military Discipline: The Compleat Souldier or Expert Artillery-Man. Published in Boston in 1701 (A second, slightly upgraded edition was published in 1706), the Military Discipline was another compilation of military instruction taken from various sources. In addition to the manual exercise, Boone included an extensive section on marching. Soldiers were to be drawn up in four or six ranks one and a half feet apart.<sup>39</sup> The distance between files varied from close order (one and a half feet) through order (three feet), open order (six feet), and double distance (twelve feet). The majority of marching commands of the period involved one of three basic maneuvers - doubling, wheeling and counter marching. Doubling (or undoubling) simply meant turning six ranks into three, four ranks into two, or vice versa. In "Doubling to the front" the men in

---

<sup>39</sup> "rank" refers to a row of men standing shoulder to shoulder, "file" refers to a row of men standing behind each other. Thus a formation of 60 soldiers in three ranks would also consist of 20 files each having three men.

the second, fourth and sixth ranks moved forward diagonally into the space to the right or left of the man in front of them, thus turning six ranks into three. The variations on this maneuver were numerous to cover any tactical situation, and could be quite complex, as in the command "Half files double your front to the right and left inward."

Wheeling was performed at close order and changed the front of the unit ninety or one hundred and eighty degrees by swinging the ranks like a door, the men near the pivot taking smaller steps than those near the outer flank, maintenance of the rank formation during the maneuver being of prime importance. In counter marching the head of each file turned and marched back through the gaps with the rest of the files following, similar to the techniques used by modern marching bands. Counter marching was sometimes combined with volley firing. When the front rank fired the men turned and passed through the other ranks to the rear while the next rank stepped up to take their place. This form of firing was rapidly losing fashion, however. The method had originally accommodated the heavy matchlock muskets which required rests and a protracted time to reload. As each rank moved into position they planted their rests and blew on their match in preparation to fire. The lighter, more efficient flintlock decreased loading time and enabled soldiers to dispense with the rest, so a new method of volley fire was developed in which the front rank kneeled,



the second rank stooped and the rear stood upright and all fired and reloaded together.

The latter method would eclipse the former as the eighteenth century progressed, and the British experience in the War of the Spanish Succession would introduce new techniques which are reflected in William Breton's Militia Discipline: The Words of Command and Directions for Exercising the Musket, Bayonet, & Cartridge published in 1733.<sup>40</sup> Breton's manual indicates the general acceptance of both paper cartridges in loading as well as the close order form of volley firing, including a new "locking" technique.<sup>41</sup> Introduced to the British army in the 1720's, locking eliminated the need for the middle rank to "stoop" when firing which was uncomfortable, unsteady and hazardous to the collar bone. The front rank still kneeled but the second rank stepped to the right slightly to fire over the shoulders of the front rank. The third rank stepped over even further so their muskets fell in the interval between the files.<sup>42</sup> Marching maneuvers continued to emphasize

---

<sup>40</sup> Breton, William, Militia Discipline: The Words of Command and Directions for Exercising the Musket, Bayonet, & Cartridge (Boston, 1733; Facsimile Copy, East Winthrop, ME, 1975)

<sup>41</sup> "Handle your Cartridge," "Open your Cartridge," "Charge with Cartridge" - Although paper cartridges had been used for decades, and were used in the colonies during the seventeenth century, earlier manuals continued to refer to the use of wooden chargers. As to the method of volley fire, "Close order is useful when they are to make any furious firing." See Breton, Militia Discipline, 42.

<sup>42</sup> Houlding, Fit for Service, 281.

doubling, wheeling and counter marching, with the following modification in the method of doubling. Instead of the even number ranks doubling the odd to their front, the fourth, fifth and sixth ranks marched forward so the fourth rank doubled the first rank.<sup>43</sup>

In the 1740's American publishers turned away from compilations and simply reprinted British military authors *in toto*. With editions published in 1743, 1744 and 1747, Humphrey Bland's An Abstract of Military Discipline in particular soon became the standard manual used in New England.<sup>44</sup> The loading sequence in Bland was reduced somewhat from previous manuals, reflecting the widespread use of paper cartridges, and marching maneuvers still involved doubling and countermarching (the British would not abandon doubling until the Seven Years War when they adopted the close order marching style of the Prussian army).<sup>45</sup>

The manuals available to provincial officers provided instruction for one type of warfare only - the linear tactic battle. The nature and complexities of linear tactics demanded constant drill and constant attention to detail to maintain an adequate level of efficiency. It was the enormous amount of time and energy required to keep their own regiments "fit for service" which convinced British officers

---

<sup>43</sup> Breton, Militia Discipline, 45.

<sup>44</sup> Updated versions of Bland were published in the colonies through the last edition in 1762.

<sup>45</sup> Humphrey Bland, An Abstract of Military Discipline (Boston, 1743)

that provincials, with their infrequent militia frolics, could never be equal to the challenge of war. Linear tactics required that the soldiers act as one, so even those rare training days accomplished little because the company that trained was not the company that took the field. When the volunteers and pressed men from several towns assembled, the rhythms of loading and volley fire would be lost, and the marching a potential disaster.<sup>46</sup>

However, this European style training served no purpose in the context of war on the New England frontier. According to John Keegan and Richard Holmes, "linear formations and methodical volleys - even if they worked as well in battle as they did on parade - were suitable only on certain sorts of terrain."<sup>47</sup> In fact, the wooded terrain of North America so influenced the tactics of war that the first true linear battle did not occur until the Plains of Abraham in 1759.<sup>48</sup> Until that battle, and especially in the

---

<sup>46</sup> For example, although the structure of county regiments attempted to promote uniformity, if soldiers from a militia company which doubled the even ranks on the odd were combined with soldiers from another company who used the doubling method of the fourth rank doubling the first, total confusion would be the result until one method was selected and practiced.

<sup>47</sup> Keegan and Holmes, Soldiers, 66.

<sup>48</sup> Edward Pierce Hamilton, "Colonial Warfare in North America," Massachusetts Historical Society Proceedings, 80 (1968), 3.; a participant in the battle, Malcolm Fraser of the Seventy-Eighth Regiment of Foot, called the Plains of Abraham "the first regular engagement that was ever fought in North America" - C. P. Stacey, Quebec, 1759: The Siege and the Battle (Toronto, 1959), 153.

early French wars, all combat involved, or at least was influenced by, the tactics of *petite guerre*. Even sieges were colored by *petite guerre* as the relieving forces, even at Louisbourg, consisted largely of Indians.<sup>49</sup>

The close order, linear formations presented in the manuals ran counter to the tactics of *petite guerre*. Linear tactics required action without thought, "the tactics of the period," observed J. A. Houlding, "sought to exclude chance in favor of control, rather than attempting to take advantage of uncertainty by encouraging in the men a spirit of initiative or individualism. A complete and docile obedience and automaton-like reflex responses to command were the touchstone of the other ranks; endless repetition of a few basic skills, together with an iron discipline, seemed to ensure both." In contrast, *petite guerre* required some independence of action. In the wooded terrain beyond the frontier line, soldiers operated in dispersed formations, often separated from their commander or the main party. Once action was joined the utilization of cover was the discretion of the individual, it required independent thought, and, unlike their British counterpart, provincial soldiers took careful aim at their targets.<sup>50</sup>

---

<sup>49</sup> I. K. Steele, Guerillas and Grenadiers: The Struggle for Canada, 1689-1760 (Toronto, 1969), 7.

<sup>50</sup> Even the French regulars had to learn this lesson. W. J. Eccles pointed out that the *Troupes de la Marine* stationed in Canada were useless until they had several years experience in forest campaigning, "fighting as individuals rather than as drilled mass units." - W. J.

Perhaps the issue of aiming best illustrates the difference between linear tactics and *petite guerre*. Cotton Mather said "The Best Marks-man will ... be the best Souldier. The Benjamites that can shoot to an Hairs Breadth will probably carry the day," and he recommended prizes be given for the best shooting at training day.<sup>51</sup> Provincial training actually placed a great deal of emphasis on "shooting at a mark." Early in the seventeenth century, Plymouth colony ordered that, in order to conserve powder, all shooting at training day be at a mark, and in 1679 Massachusetts ordered that militia officers "not onely traine theire souldiers in theire postures and motions but alsoe at shooting att Markes."<sup>52</sup> J. A Houlding found that British authorities, despite the fact their manuals did stress the importance of shooting at a target, issued only two rounds per man per year in peacetime. "Since controlled volley fire was considered more important than individually aimed fire -- and the peacetime issue of ball is a clear measure of just how much importance was attached to volley fire, over aimed fire -- it was upon volley fire in platoon that peacetime training was concentrated. Squibs [blanks] provided a sufficient degree of realism for this purpose."<sup>53</sup>

---

Eccles, Canada Under Louis XIV, 1663-1701 (London, 1964), 191.

<sup>51</sup> Mather, Cotton, Military Duties, 22

<sup>52</sup> Plymouth Colony Militia laws, 1634, Background of Selective Service, 10; Massachusetts Militia laws, 1677, Background of Selective Service, 124.

<sup>53</sup> Houlding, Fit for Service, 262.

The British would not encourage marksmanship until the end of the eighteenth century, after they had extensive experience with fighting in the New World.

Not only did the techniques differ between *petite guerre* and linear combat, but it was actually dangerous to -- instill close order drill on men whose principle fighting involved ambush and the effective utilization of terrain. At the battle of Casco in 1689, Benjamin Church "bid his Indian soldiers scatter, [and] run very thin, to preserve themselves and be better able to make a discovery of the enemy."<sup>54</sup> Church always ordered the men under his command to "run very thin" because he knew close formations provided too much of a target. During his fifth raid into Maine in 1704 he was infuriated during one action to find "so many of the army in a crowd together, acting so contrary to my command and direction, exposing themselves and the whole army to utter ruin, by their so disorderly crowding thick together. Had an enemy come upon them in that interim, and fired a volley amongst them, they could not have missed a shot."<sup>55</sup>

The inadequacy of the infrequent and riotous militia training should not be used to gauge the provincial soldier's preparation for war. Muster day training involved linear formations and linear tactics, and thus taught a way of war foreign to them. The absenteeism and, perhaps more

---

<sup>54</sup> Church, History of the Great Indian War, 169.

<sup>55</sup> Church, History of the Great Indian War, 266.

importantly, the exemption from training for officers who had performed provincial service indicates that, beyond the administrative function, militia training served no purpose. Provincial soldiers could not be automatons, they had to think and react to situations, at the very least find cover and chose their own targets. As Benjamin Church ordered his company when confronted by a potential enemy, they had to "clap down and cock their guns."<sup>56</sup> Recognizing the essential elements for frontier fighting, Church recommended that soldiers in service should be inspected by "men of known judgement" to "see if their arms be good and they know how to use them in shooting right, at a mark, and that they be men of good reason and sense to know how to manage themselves in so difficult a piece of service as this Indian hunting is."<sup>57</sup>

Actually, Church's comment provides a key to understanding how New England soldiers trained for war, because more than any formal drill, hunting provided the provincials with the best training for *petite guerre*. The tracking, concealment and marksmanship required in hunting game served them far better than doubling, wheeling and volley fire. Not surprisingly, New England's best military leaders and scouts were often described as great hunters, as when Samuel Penhallow characterized John Lovewell as a man "endowed with a generous Spirit and Resolution of serving his Country, and

---

<sup>56</sup> Church, History of the Great Indian War, 196

<sup>57</sup> Church, History of the Great Indian War, 247.

well acquainted with hunting the Woods."<sup>58</sup> Richard Slotkin, in his Regeneration Through Violence: The Mythology of the American Frontier, 1600-1860, recognized that "hunting" was a recurring theme in the literature of New England during the French War Period. "The exorcism of the Indians is likened to the hunting down and slaying of rapid beasts embodying all qualities of evil."<sup>59</sup>

British officials, and some historians, would continue to disparage the provincial because he lacked European style training, yet, as Keegan and Holmes have indicated, such training could also "submerge initiative and rational thought ... The Prussian army lost the battle of Jena in 1806 despite the excellence of its drill, and the Israeli army, one of the most consistently successful forces of this century, is not noted for its zeal for presenting arms."<sup>60</sup> The provincial soldier knew that the want of formal education in linear tactics was not a handicap in his experience, they understood that their ability was proved in the woods of New England, although British military and government officials were slow to recognize it. When Governor Jonathan Belcher addressed the New Hampshire legislature in February,

---

<sup>58</sup> Samuel Penhallow, The History of the Wars of New England with the Eastern Indians (Boston, 1726; Facsimile Reprint, Annotated by Edward Wheelock, Williamstown, MA, 1973), 110.

<sup>59</sup> Richard Slotkin, Regeneration Through Violence: The Mythology of the American Frontier, 1600-1860 (Middletown, CN, 1973), 154.

<sup>60</sup> Keegan and Holmes, Soldiers, 44.



1740, he noted that the "officers of the militia tell me the two regiments of the province are well furnished with arms and ammunition and that they are exercised according to law. But that the appearances are thin on Muster days the fine for non-appearance not being equal to twelve pence stirring." Belcher reminded the Assembly he had repeatedly requested that the fines be raised, and he urged them once again to vote for an increase so "the private companies in their musters and also the regiments at their general musters may be full and so the whole militia better disciplined and fitted for the service whenever there may be occasion for them. Such a law as I now mention passed about two years ago in the Mass Bay and the fine appearance of the militia of that Province is hardly to be equalled in any of his Majesty's dominions."<sup>61</sup> The House weighed very carefully his words and replied the following day that "With respect to what you mention of the fine appearance of the militia of the neighboring Province ... though ours may never equal them in *show* we shall be glad to do everything in our power that they may be capable of doing as much *real* service when called to it."<sup>62</sup>

---

<sup>61</sup> "Address to the House by Gov. Belcher, Feb. 1, 1740," Nathaniel Bouton, Documents and Records Relating to the Province of New Hampshire from 1738-1749 (Nashua, NH, 1871), New Hampshire Provincial and State Papers, Vol. V, 11-12.

<sup>62</sup> "House's Answer to Belcher's Speech, Feb. 15, 1740," Bouton, ed., NHSP, 18-20. Emphasis mine.

Doubling, wheeling, counter marching and volley fire were fundamental to battle drill for European soldiers preparing for linear tactic combat, but had little relation to warfare on the northern frontier of New England. Proficiency in such tactics requires a commitment to long and consistent hours of training, a commitment only possible for the professional soldier, or at least extended terms of enlistment. The provincial soldiers of New England would not, and could not devote themselves to mastering a form of combat they had little use for. Although European style linear formations provided a "finer appearance" on muster day, and gave the sham battle a sense of choreography, an increase in this training would not have prepared provincials for the combat of *petite guerre*, and would actually have been detrimental, if not suicidal.

But while the European training proved useless as battle drill, such preparation is only half the purpose of military discipline. It also prepared soldiers for the stress of combat by instilling a fighting spirit and unit cohesion. "Battle is a harrowing business," wrote John Keegan and Richard Holmes,

In addition to the physical risks of death or injury, the soldier is subjected to the intense psychological pressures generated by exhaustion, privation, noise, worries about family and friends, and the sight of comrades being killed and wounded. Yet, as Field-

Marshal Haig admitted: 'Men are not brave by nature.' The fighting spirit that enables the soldier to meet the stress of battle must be built and sustained: training, comradeship, leadership and discipline all play their parts in its creation.<sup>63</sup>

In Acts of War: The Behavior of Men in Battle, Richard Holmes specified that the "prime purpose of military training is to produce effectiveness on the battlefield. Much of it is devoted, either directly or indirectly, to enabling the soldier to cope with the stress-filled environment of combat."<sup>64</sup> Military discipline, training, traditions, and ceremony all serve to submerge an individual within a larger entity which will, hopefully, overpower the primal urge for self-preservation. World War II war correspondent Alan Moorehead noted that "the drill, the saluting, the uniform, the very badges on your arm all tend to identify you with a solid machine and build up a feeling of security and order. In the moment of danger the soldier turns to his mechanical habits and draws strength from them." John Keegan and Richard Holmes found Moorehead's observation "brilliantly perceptive. The process of military training is designed as much to inculcate the group cohesion and solidarity upon which fighting spirit depends

---

<sup>63</sup> Keegan and Holmes, Soldiers, 39.

<sup>64</sup> Holmes, Acts of War, 28.

as it is to produce an adequate level of technical or tactical expertise."<sup>65</sup>

Such was the purpose of European military traditions and training in the eighteenth century. The colorful uniforms, the flags, and the ceremonies of the regimental system inculcated in recruits and soldiers a belief that they belonged to something greater and more important than their individualism. The creation of automatons through repetitious and harsh drilling also attempted to aid soldiers in coping with battlefield stress, it provided what Richard Holmes called "a raft of familiarity in an uncertain environment."<sup>66</sup> Less charitably perhaps, but with the certain conviction of the European officer class, Frederick the Great put it another way. "If my soldiers began to think," he said "not one would remain in the ranks."

Carl von Clausewitz referred to the fighting spirit created by such military training and discipline as the "military virtue." He believed that military virtue is "distinguished from mere bravery, and still more from enthusiasm for the business of War." These attributes are individual gifts not possessed by most men. Military virtue is a corporate spirit.<sup>67</sup> Military training and discipline instill this corporate spirit, and also created a bonding or comradeship among the disparate individuals gathered into

<sup>65</sup> Keegan and Holmes, Soldiers, 42.

<sup>66</sup> Holmes, Acts of War, 237.

<sup>67</sup> Clausewitz, On War, 254-5.

European armies. As one eighteenth French military theorist wrote,

Personal bravery of a single individual does not decide on the day of battle, but the bravery of the unit, and the latter rests on the good opinion and the confidence that each individual places in the unit to which he belongs. The exterior splendour, the regularity of movements, the adroitness and at the same time firmness of the mass - all this gives the individual soldier the safe and calming conviction that nothing can withstand his particular regiment or battalion.<sup>68</sup>

It is the absence of this military virtue, the absence of European discipline and traditions, which has led so many historians and other observers to the conclusion that provincial soldiers lacked fighting spirit or the military virtue. Provincial units served only short time together, never over a year and usually only for a few weeks or months, then disbanded and others created. Thus they could never equal European units in fighting spirit. In describing the disastrous Quebec expedition of 1690, historian James Truslow Adams concluded that "the self-flattering belief ... that training of any sort is a waste of time, and that, in military affairs, competent commanders and disciplined troops can be found at any moment in a crisis, had

---

<sup>68</sup> Quoted in Keegan and Holmes, *Soldiers*, 46.

again proved a costly fallacy."<sup>69</sup> Francis Parkman agreed with this assessment, finding that "Massachusetts had made her usual mistake. She had confidently believed that ignorance and inexperience could match the skill of a tried veteran, and that the rude courage of her fishermen and farmers could triumph without discipline or leadership."<sup>70</sup>

However, as Clausewitz observed, it should not be thought that military discipline and "military virtue is in the end everything. It is not so ... Soldiers may fight bravely ... and do great things like the Swiss, the Americans, or Spaniards, without displaying this military virtue."<sup>71</sup> One factor in determining the effectiveness of traditional military virtue is the terrain over which wars are fought. "The national spirit of an army (enthusiasm, fanatical zeal, faith, opinion) displays itself most in mountain warfare," wrote Clausewitz, "where every one down to the common soldier is left to himself. On this account, a mountainous country is the best campaigning for popular levies. Expertness of an Army through training, and that well-tempered courage which holds the ranks together as if they had been cast in a mould, show their superiority in an open country."<sup>72</sup>

---

<sup>69</sup> Quoted in Steele, Guerillas and Grenadiers, 29-30.

<sup>70</sup> Francis Parkman, Count Frontenac and New France under Louis XIV (Boston, 1896), 285.

<sup>71</sup> Clausewitz, On War, 255. The quotes are reversed in order.

<sup>72</sup> Clausewitz, On War, 253.

European battle was normally very deliberate in nature. It often took literally hours to set up artillery and maneuver regiments into position before commencing the action. This provided soldiers with considerable time for reflection and anticipation, and for most soldiers the ordeal of anticipation is harder on the emotions than the fighting itself. "It is hard to exaggerate the degree of stress imposed by this feeling of pre-contact apprehension," wrote Richard Holmes, "which usually occurs, with varying intensity, before every battle in which a soldier participates. ...The tension that builds up, especially before a setpiece action, can almost become unbearable."<sup>73</sup>

It was during the awful tension before the battle, tension created by the fear of death, wounds and cowardice, that European soldiers drew strength from the military virtue. In watching the enemy move their battalions into position, or listening to the roar of cannon and musket fire, the soldier could remember the traditions of his own regiment, see the war torn colors bravely flying over his head, and trust in the unit spirit to carry them through the coming ordeal.

But provincial soldiers rarely experienced this kind of anticipation. Only in a handful of actions, usually associated with expeditions, did New Englanders share the pre-battle trial of their European counterparts. The landing at Quebec in 1690 was such an occasion, as was the attack on

---

<sup>73</sup> Holmes, Acts of War, 139, 145.

Cartagena in which the provincials actively supported the redcoat assault. The most famous action which allowed New Englanders the chance of reflection before combat was the attack on the Island Battery at Louisbourg in 1745.

It was decided that the Island Battery, which prevented the British ships from entering the harbor, should be taken by storm in a night action. Loaded into boats, the provincials began their nerve-racking row to the island. Here there was plenty of time for anticipation and reflection as the boats made their agonizing approach. As the story is frequently told, it was a drunken soldier who ruined the plan by raising three cheers when he landed. This shout alerted the French who opened up on the loaded boats still floundering in the water. However, the tension of the approach may have had more to do with the soldier's indiscretion than alcohol. Soldier's experiencing such pre-battle tension find release when the fighting begins.<sup>74</sup> After approaching an enemy held island in the dark, expecting any minute to be fired on with grapeshot and canister, the physical act of landing must have felt like a relief, expressed by this one soldier, whether under the influence or not, as an untimely cheer.

For most provincial soldiers warfare on the frontier of surprise and ambush thrust them directly into action,

---

<sup>74</sup> As Richard Holmes observed, "although the soldier in action is in immediate physical danger, the very fact that he is at least committed to battle often comes as a relief." See Holmes, Acts of War, 147.



providing little time for reflection or anticipation. If springing an ambush pre-battle contact with the enemy was brief, and if on the receiving end of a surprise attack it was non-existent. Rather than a gradual buildup of adrenaline and emotional acceptance, provincial soldiers had to react in seconds to an instant and dangerous change in their circumstances. They had no time to reflect on military traditions, uniforms, flags or ceremonies.

*La petite guerre* produced unique pressures and anxieties of its own, especially for soldiers involved in patrols and raids. Provincials soldiers did not reflect only on what might happen, but when. The enemy was unseen and unknown, delineated only by the limits of the imagination. Indeed, many provincial scouting parties, far removed from assistance, found their worst enemy to be the imagination. Seth Wyman's scout toward Monadnock mountain in 1707, which resulted in a court-martial "for their returne home in a mutinous disorderly manner," underscores the special fears promoted by the wilderness.<sup>75</sup> Early in the morning, Wyman dispatched two scouting parties, one to the right, one to the left, to search for sign of the enemy. According to the deposition provided by Samuel Scripture, the left scout found the tracks of Indian dogs or wolves and followed them for about a quarter of a mile. Suddenly, they met the right scout "who called us away and told us they

---

<sup>75</sup> The account is contained in Samuel A. Green, *Groton During the Indian Wars* (Groton, MA, 1883), 98-101. See Chapter Four for further details.

believed there was a thousand Indians upon which we hastened away but [the other] scout ran so fast that I could not come up with them to understand what their discovery was." The excited men crowded around Wyman and his officers until Wyman, fearing that they made too good a target, "ordered his men to stand farther off and give room that he might discourse his officers, upon which many of them ran away."

Jonathan Butterfield confirmed Scripture's account, and added that Wyman "talked of marching immediately to the Place of discovery but many of our men moved off disorderly." Wyman's deposition confirms that he "incouraged his men by telling them that they had a brave advantage of the Enemy, in that they had discovered them and were not themselves discovered." Some of the officers, believing the account of a thousand Indians, disagreed and recommended caution, "upon which Sergeant Tarbol threw down his Cap, and offered himself to go if but four men would go with him." The officers pointed out that most of the men had already left, and so Wyman found himself "too weak to attack them and accordingly made the best of my way home."

Richard Holmes indicated that "once a panic gets under way it develops a frenetic momentum of its own," and such was the case in the Wyman scout.<sup>76</sup> Despite the encouragements of Seth Wyman, who would years later be cited for bravery for his actions in Lovewell's last battle, and of Wyman's sergeant, the original panic caused by the over-

---

<sup>76</sup> Holmes, Acts of War, 227-8.

active imagination of the right hand scout could not be contained. A similar occurrence happened to a company of New Hampshire men sent by Lt-Governor John Wentworth to the scene of Lovewell's fight in 1725. The company, which had orders to meet with a Massachusetts company being sent on the same errand, arrived at Lovewell's temporary fort and proceeded no further. Apparently the image of what had happened to Lovewell and his men loomed large in their minds. Wentworth wrote to Lt-Governor William Dummer that he was concerned over the mismanagement of the affair. "We all accounted them stout men," but they had been discouraged by not meeting the other company. "Its a strange thing our people should be so dispirited," concluded Wentworth, "there was in the 53 I sent out 40, as likely lusty Midle aged men as can be found in our hole Province but so it was."<sup>77</sup>

Later that fall, Dummer cautioned Colonel Thomas Westbrook not to let the reports of a force of 500 Indians descending from Canada spark the imaginations of his men. "I observe the soldiers make a handle of it for Cowardice by every small party they meet with afterwards."<sup>78</sup> Westbrook replied that he "always caution every body to make less

---

<sup>77</sup> "Wentworth to Dummer, May 28, 1725," James Phinney Baxter, ed., Documentary History of the State of Maine, (Portland, ME, 1907), Collections of the Maine Historical Society, 2nd Series, Vol. X, 283-4.

<sup>78</sup> "Dummer to Westbrook, September 24, 1725," Baxter, ed., Doc. Hist. Me., Vol. X, 339.

rather than more of what they hear or see, relating the Enemy notwithstanding some make the most of everything."<sup>79</sup>

The constant threat of the unseen enemy in the wilderness haunted soldiers in the New World, and some succumbed to the threat before it actually materialized. Richard Slotkin, in Regeneration Through Violence: The Mythology of the American Frontier, 1600-1860, indicated that "the Puritan who lost his self-restraint in the terrors of an Indian fight knew that he had been overthrown by the powers of his own inner darkness, allied with the darkness of the woods."<sup>80</sup> However, some New Englanders did not fear the wilderness or the woods. Benjamin Church never allowed his imagination to run away from him, neither did John Lovewell, Johnson Harmon, or James Converse. In addition, the fears of the unseen enemy, like the fears before a linear tactic battle, often left when action was joined. For the European soldier, the military virtue, the fighting spirit raised through training and ceremony, brought him through the carnage, while the repetitious drill guided his hands with little thought. But without this training and discipline, the provincial soldier had to draw on other strengths to carry him through the horror of combat.

---

<sup>79</sup> "Westbrook to Dummer, October 1, 1725," Baxter, ed., Doc. Hist. Me., Vol. X, 342.

<sup>80</sup> Richard Slotkin, Regeneration Through Violence: The Mythology of the American Frontier, 1600-1860 (Middletown, Conn., 1973), 165.

The reason men fight in battle are different from the reasons they enlist. Provincial soldiers volunteered mainly for financial gain, but also for a chance at adventure, and for their province and King. However, when the fear and adrenaline surge accompanying combat began, few New Englanders thought of the financial security their service might bring, nor did they think of the benefits to their country. Other motives drove them to fight and possibly die.

Hatred of the enemy, especially the Eastern Indians, was intense. As John Keegan and Richard Holmes indicated, armies in Europe in the eighteenth century tended "to slip into peaceful co-existence between battles," and exhibited a reluctance to kill his other outside the confines of battle. But on the New England frontier, there was no such peaceful co-existence. Unlike the French "enemy", the Eastern Indians were "rebels" known for their treachery and cruelty.<sup>81</sup> Indians were rarely shown quarter in battle, and the Indian male who found himself a prisoner was often abused and tormented, even killed.<sup>82</sup> This hatred also found expression in the words of mortally wounded men who wanted to "kill one more" before they died.<sup>83</sup>

---

<sup>81</sup> "Governor Joseph Dudley to the Council of Trade and Plantations, March 1, 1709," Calendar of State Papers, Vol. 24, No. 392.

<sup>82</sup> Church, The History of the Great Indian War, 187-9. See Chapter Twelve for more on this point.

<sup>83</sup> During a fight between a provincial shallop and canoes full of Indians in 1707, one Benjamin Daniel was shot through "the Bowels soon after they came to sail; At his fall he said, 'I am a dead Man!' yet recovering

If the soldiers ever had the occasion to forget their hatred, the Puritan ministers of New England were present to remind them, although such reminders came before any action, not during. When Cotton Mather said the Indians "have horribly Murdered some Scores of your dear Country-men, whoose Blood cries in your Ears, while you are going to Fight, Vengeance, Dear Country-men! Vengeance upon our Murderers!", he did so to encourage volunteers and animate men who had already enlisted.<sup>84</sup> Such religious reminders of duty and Indian cruelty tended to proceed from political rather than spiritual motives.<sup>85</sup>

---

himself a little added, 'Let me kill one before I dye!' but he had not the strength to fire." See Penhallow, The History of the Wars of New England, 46. Lieutenant Jonathan Robbins, mortally wounded during Lovewell's fight, expressed the same sentiment, asking that his musket be loaded before the survivors left so he could "kill another of 'em if I can." See Penhallow, The History of the Wars of New England, 115; Francis Parkman, A Half-Century of Conflict (Boston, 1892), 255. The relationship between the Eastern Indians and the provincial soldiers is similar to that experienced in the Pacific war during World War II. See Chapter Eleven for more details.

<sup>84</sup> Mather, Cotton, Souldiers Counsell'd and Comforted; A discourse Delivered unto Some part of the Forces Engaged in the Just War of New-England Against the Northern & Eastern Indians (Boston, 1689), 28.

<sup>85</sup> Melvin E. Endy found that New England ministers were motivated by political rather than religious concerns. See Melvin E. Endy, Jr., "Just War, Holy War, and Millennialism in Revolutionary America," William and Mary Quarterly, 3rd series, XLII (1985), 3-4. Samuel Adams Drake wrote that "Honest Samuel Sewall, our Pepys, records that 'several ministers pray'd (at the desire of the court) that God would speedily, by some Providence or one way other, let us know what might doe as to going against Port Royal.'" See Drake, The Border Wars of New England, 226.

However, ministers did accompany soldiers, serving with them in forts, on expeditions and scouts, and even participated in combat. Their presence was encouraged by both the soldiers and the provincial governments.<sup>86</sup> Officers were ordered to maintain the worship of God in their commands, even to the point of making sure soldiers attended morning and evening prayer. In 1689, "commanded by the Governor and Council to keep up the worship of God as much as I could during the expedition," Jeremiah Swain pressed the Reverend John Emerson as chaplain. Swain reported that Emerson "did faithfully attend that place, being helpfull to us in his advice and council, and finding himself both horse and furnature Served us Eleven weekes."<sup>87</sup> Such ministers often found themselves in the thick of the fight. The minister of Casco participated in the Battle of Brackett's Woods in 1689, the Reverend John Wise was active during the landing at Quebec the following year, and the young graduate of Harvard and student of theology, Jonathan Frye, shouldered a musket and fell mortally wounded with Lovewell in 1725.<sup>88</sup>

---

<sup>86</sup> Ministers in frontier garrisons served the towns as well, but were paid by the Provincial governments. See James Phinney Baxter, ed., Documentary History of the State of Maine (Portland, ME, 1897), Collections of the Maine Historical Society, 2nd Series, Vol. V, 528-30; Charles E. Clark, The Eastern Frontier: The Settlement of Northern New England, 1610-1763 (New York, 1970), 83.

<sup>87</sup> "Grant to Mr. John Emerson, February 14, 1690," Baxter, ed., Doc. Hist. Me., Vol. V, 49.

<sup>88</sup> Drake, The Border Wars of New England, 41; "Narrative of Mr. John Wise, Minister of God's Word at Chebacco," Massachusetts Historical Society Proceedings, Vol XV, 287-94 (14); Parkman, Half-Century of Conflict, 253.

However, there is little evidence to indicate that religion, despite the presence of ministers in battle, provided the fighting spirit to carry soldiers through combat. Christian soldiers they may have been on the whole, but when the musket balls flew it was not their obligation to God which motivated their action. Even the ministers did not necessarily call upon religious images in the heat of battle. When Reverend Wise found soldiers chasing the French instead of attacking the city during the landing at Quebec in 1690, he told one group that they were "out of your Witte we did not come hither to drive a parcel of Cowardly Frenchmen from Swamp to Swamp but to attack Kebeque thither Gentlemen is our business, Why Dont we march away for the Towne of Kebeque." The following day when John Walley had ordered the landing troops back to the beach, Wise perceived that the men had lost spirit, but he did not preach, "I challenge them to get up and run for a Dram of the bottle a Temptacon fit for Souldiers."<sup>99</sup>

To understand where provincial soldiers got their fighting spirit it is necessary to reiterate the most important purpose of military training - the bonding of men into a cohesive group, what Clausewitz called the "corporate spirit". As Richard Holmes wrote, "for the key to what makes men fight - not enlist, not cope but fight - we must look hard at military groups and the bonds that link men

---

<sup>99</sup> "Narrative of Mr. John Wise," Mass. Hist. Soc. Proceedings, Vol. XV, 288, 293 (14).



within them."<sup>90</sup> By fostering a sympathy and affection, as well as respect, between men in a military unit, the fear of dishonor and cowardice motivates them to fight. American military historian S. L. A. Marshall believed that, "personal honor is the thing valued more than life by the majority of men."<sup>91</sup>

What the European training and discipline attempted to create artificially among the strangers constituting their armies, provincial soldiers brought with them into service naturally.<sup>92</sup> Volunteers knew each other, or knew each other's towns and families, and they knew the officers they chose to serve under. An Englishman joining a line regiment in the British army surrendered his ties to the outside world. His enlistment was for life, and the regiment became his new home. But provincial volunteers, serving only for a short time, maintained a connection to community and family, and failure to serve honorably would bring shame on those communities and families as well as themselves.<sup>93</sup>

---

<sup>90</sup> Holmes, Acts of War, 291.

<sup>91</sup> Quoted in Keegan and Holmes, Soldiers, 52.

<sup>92</sup> Clausewitz observed that "the natural qualities of a warlike people play just this part: bravery, aptitude, powers of endurance and enthusiasm. These properties may therefore supply the place of military virtue, and vice versa, from which the following may be deduced: Military virtue is a quality of standing Armies only, but they require it the most. In national risings its place is supplied by natural qualities, which develop themselves there more rapidly." See Clausewitz, On War, 256.

<sup>93</sup> The emphasis here is on the volunteers who tended to have ties to communities. The have-nots of society who were

Such spirit is not unique in military history. Other soldiers have performed remarkably well without the need of formal military discipline. The Swiss soldiers of the fifteenth century served in companies and units drawn from the same valley, village or guild. The soldiers knew each other, and knew their reputations would be judged on the battlefield. They carried the bonds of the village with them to the army, and their reputation for ferocity and giving no quarter became legendary.<sup>94</sup> The original Swedish army of King Gustavas Adolphus also carried this community spirit with them, as all regiments were recruited from their own districts. The British government in the eighteenth century rarely had reason to complain of the performance of Scottish Highland troops on the battlefield. These men also retained a strong connection to their home communities which became a pledge of their good behavior. Misbehavior or cowardice meant shame and even the punishment of eviction for families at home. With such a natural fighting spirit, the British government usually allowed Highland regiments little time for training, sending them to war zones as soon as they were raised.<sup>95</sup>

---

pressed or hired did not always have such ties, and thus could not be relied on in battle. This is why frontier commanders placed them in garrisons and took volunteers on their raids.

<sup>94</sup> Archer Jones, The Art of War in the Western World (Urbanna, Il, 1987), 177.

<sup>95</sup> Highlanders were told their names would be hung on the church door if they failed in their duty. For more see John Prebble, Mutiny: Highland Regiments in Revolt, 1743-1804 (New York, 1975), 98-102. At the end of the

The bonds of the community taken into military service gave the provincial soldier fighting spirit. The connections of familial and neighborly ties were recognized and fostered by allowing soldiers to choose the officers under whom they would serve, and by stipulating in levying acts that volunteers "will not be compelled to ... change companies without their consent."<sup>96</sup> Samuel Waldo believed one of the reasons for the failure of the attack on the Island Battery at Louisbourg was the breaking of these communal bonds. Whole companies were not involved in the attack but rather individual volunteers taken from all companies, most under new officers chosen for the assignment. Waldo wrote to William Pepperrell that the men involved in the attack should be under their own officers and that "severall men were detatched against their will." He wondered "whether stragling fellows, some 2, others 3, 4, and 7 out of a company, should go on this design. I am firmly of opinion

---

nineteenth century, the British faced a formidable army which drew on a natural fighting spirit instead of formal military training. The Boers of South Africa were citizen soldiers without formal military training who managed to confound the British army for three years. One British war correspondent remarked that in the Boer army the "wonderful intelligence in the individual ... plays the part of cultivated discipline." See Thomas Pakenham, The Boer War (New York, 1979), 290.

<sup>96</sup> "Levying Act of 1721," Massachusetts Militia Laws, Background of Selective Service, 160.

that such without any officers belonging to them will be a disservice."<sup>97</sup>

The threat of dishonor and shame among men bonded in a military unit, whether through training or communal ties, can be a powerful force. Richard Holmes wrote that "there are occasions when this desire to preserve status is quite literally stronger than the fear of death."<sup>98</sup> Such was the case of Richard Jacques. Jacques was Johnson Harmon's son-in-law and supposedly killed Father Sabastian Rasle during the Norridgewock raid in 1724. Jacques continued to serve in the provincial military and later went to Louisbourg. According to family legend, Jacques was with a scout near Penobscot bay sometime after returning to Louisbourg when his commander ordered him to take his men across an open field. Jacques argued that it was a perfect spot for an ambush, but his commander insisted, calling Jacques a coward. Stung by the accusation, Richard Jacques honor and pride led him out into that open field where, as he had predicted, he fell mortally wounded from an ambush.<sup>99</sup>

Richard Holmes has also indicated that group spirit does not necessarily produce positive results. Soldiers who refuse to advance or become involved in a mass panic are

---

<sup>97</sup> "Waldo to Pepperrell, May, 1745," "Pepperrell Papers," Collections of the Massachusetts Historical Society, Series VI, Vol. X (1899), 213-5.

<sup>98</sup> Holmes, Acts of War, 143.

<sup>99</sup> William Hutchinson Rowe, Ancient North Yarmouth and Yarmouth, Maine, 1636-1936 (Yarmouth, ME, 1937), 61.

also acting within the spirits of a group. In the provincial service collective action involved less shame and dishonor. Scouting companies who broke and scattered when attacked by overwhelming forces were considered to have shown prudence rather than cowardice. The mutinous spirit at Louisbourg was also condoned by the general approbation within the ranks of the New England regiments. But the kinship and communal ties brought to provincial military service allowed few individual acts of dishonor or cowardice. The actions of Benjamin Hassell at Lovewell's fight were exceptional rather than the rule.

The Reverend Thomas Symmes recognized this spirit when he wrote about Lovewell's last fight. According the Symmes, Lovewell's men discussed their options before leaving their packs to investigate the Indian sighting. Although an enemy ambush was a very real possibility, and the reduction of their numbers through sickness had increased their vulnerability, Lovewell's men decided to continue. "We came out to meet the Enemy; we have all along Pray'd God we might find 'em; and we had rather trust Providence with our Lives, yea Dy for our Country, than try to Return without seeing them, if we may, and be called Cowards for our Pains."<sup>100</sup>

---

<sup>100</sup> Thomas Symmes, Historical Memoirs of the Battle at Pigswacket or Lovewell Lament'd (Boston, 1725), 4. Of course, Symmes was writing after the event, so this cannot be taken as a direct quote. But Symmes did apparently talk with the survivors and this probably captures the spirit of the conversation.

Warfare on the northern frontier was fought by different rules and under different conditions than warfare in Europe, and so it is unreasonable to judge provincial soldiers by a European standard. *La petite guerre* demanded instant individual decisions and judgements, linear warfare demanded automatic conditioning. Frontier warfare focused on surprise and ambush, European warfare on the deliberate, set piece battle. "Regulations designed to keep dull-witted conscripts together on the shoulder-to-shoulder battlefields of the blackpowder era," wrote Keegan and Holmes, "are inappropriate in an age when weapons and tactics demand dispersion on the battlefield, and when initiative may be more important than blind obedience. In the last analysis, fighting spirit centres upon the morale of the individual soldier and the small group of comrades with whom he fights. S. L. A. Marshall was convinced that it was the quintessential ingredient of success in battle. 'If I learned nothing else from war,' he wrote,

it taught me the falseness of the belief that wealth, material resources, and industrial genius are the real sources of a nation's military power. These things are but the stage setting: those who manage them but the stage crew. The play's the thing. Finally, every action large or small is decided by what happens up there on the line where men take the final chance of life or death.... And so the final and greatest

reality, that national strength lies only in the hearts and spirits of men.<sup>101</sup>

Provincial volunteers took with them into combat the bonding of community and kinship, and they had no use for kind of discipline and training required of European soldiers. As Benjamin Church remarked, provincial soldiers had to "be men of good reason and sense," not machines.<sup>102</sup> When musket shot and war cries announced an Indian ambush, officers did not want automatons dulled by repetitious drill, they needed men who would react instantly and follow them in a charge, or "clap down" and take careful aim at an elusive enemy. Such men were produced through experience with the wilderness environment, not on the drill fields of Europe.

---

<sup>101</sup> Keegan and Holmes, Soldiers, 56.

<sup>102</sup> Keegan and Holmes, Soldiers, 247.

## CHAPTER TEN

### FACING THE ENEMY

It has almost become a cliché to say that battle is the ultimate objective of soldiers.<sup>1</sup> Soldiers exist in order to fight, it is combat which defines their function. Despite the fact battle is infrequent, so infrequent that many soldiers never experience enemy fire, its impact looms large. During battle the adrenaline flow produces a wide range of behavior from apparent calm to wild exhilaration. As John Keegan and Richard Holmes wrote, "many soldiers experience battle as a half-remembered blur, a mosaic somehow fragmented and haphazardly reassembled."<sup>2</sup> The prevailing feeling before battle is fear -- fear of death and fear of cowardice, but beyond the fear, according to Keegan and Holmes, "a single question looms large, dwarfing every fear of death and wounds. 'What will battle really be like?'"<sup>3</sup>

The combat experienced by provincial soldiers differed greatly from their contemporary European counterparts.

---

<sup>1</sup> John Keegan and Richard Holmes, Soldiers: A History of Men in Battle (New York, 1985), 261.

<sup>2</sup> Keegan and Holmes, Soldiers, 263.

<sup>3</sup> Keegan and Holmes, Soldiers, 261.



European battles were distinguished by roar of artillery and musketry, and a choking, blinding blanket of powder smoke as armies numbering tens of thousands battered and clawed at each other. All maneuvering was deliberate and slow on the battlefield for fear that confusion or untimely enthusiasm might destroy tactical designs. Combat lasted most of the day, ending with the retreat of one army or darkness. European siege warfare created a similar environment -- the constant roar of cannon and a deliberate, almost leisurely pace.<sup>4</sup>

Provincial soldiers rarely participated in this form of combat. At Quebec in 1690 they listened to the firing of Sir William Phips' naval guns bombarding the town. The sieges of Port Royal in 1710, Cartagena in 1741 and Louisbourg in 1745 also exposed provincials to European style battle conditions. Louisbourg in particular impressed provincial soldiers because the roar of cannon fire was so unusual. One anonymous diarist recorded on May 13 that "Eighty Cannons have been Discharged in a Quarter of an hour," and four days later he wrote, "now while I am writing none but those that hear (or that have been in Some such an Engagement) Can Think how much firing there is here, Cannons Constantly A going, and Bombs, etc. and Altho I'm Two Miles

---

<sup>4</sup> For descriptions of seventeenth and eighteenth century battles see Archer Jones, The Art of War in the Western World (Urbana, IL, 1987), Chapters Four and Five.

from them they Don't Seem to be above Sixty rods they are so powerful."<sup>5</sup>

But Louisbourg and Cartagena were the exceptions, not the rule. Governed by the tactics of *petite guerre*, battles on the northern frontier, if we can use that grand term for such actions, tended to be short and sharp, often not lasting over thirty minutes. The roar of artillery did not disturb the combatants, and the numbers involved rarely exceeded more than a few hundred. More commonly frontier combat pitted a handful of desperate men in a swift, savage test of wills in the forested wilderness which delineated the colonies of New France and New England.

Examples of such combat are numerous. In January, 1707 Colonel Winthrop Hilton surprised eighteen Indians at dawn and killed all but one while they were asleep. Once the firing began, the action probably lasted no longer than five minutes.<sup>6</sup> Similarly, Johnson Harmon and a company of thirty-four soldiers investigated some campfires they detected as they rowed up the Kennebeck river one night in July, 1722. They found eleven canoes pulled up on shore and then stumbled over some sleeping Indians in the dark. The provincials opened fire and killed fifteen Indians without sustaining any casualties. The whole affair lasted ten

---

<sup>5</sup> Louis E. De Forest, Louisbourg Journals: 1745 (New York, 1932), 16, 17.

<sup>6</sup> Samuel Penhallow, The History of the Wars of New England with the Eastern Indians (Boston, 1726; Facsimile Reprint, Annotated by Edward Wheelock, Williamstown, MA, 1973), 40-1.

minutes.<sup>7</sup> In September, 1725, as a scout of six men were resting on their return to Fort Dummer, they heard a noise like running, looked up and saw fourteen Indians charging their camp. The white men opened fire but the surprise was complete, and two of the soldiers were killed, three captured and one managed to slip away. The actual fight lasted only two or three minutes.<sup>8</sup>

The attack on Norridgewock in 1725, New England's most successful engagement with the Eastern Indians, probably lasted only twenty minutes. While Johnson Harmon took half of the force to sweep through the cornfields, Jeremiah Moulton attacked the village. Dividing his men into three sections, he posted one third on the north side of the village, another third to the south and advanced toward the east gate with the remainder. As Johnson Harmon later related the events,

There was not an Indian to be seen, being all in their wigwams. Our men were ordered to advance softly, and to keep a profound silence. At length an Indian came out of one of the wigwams ... and discovered the English close upon him. He immediately gave the war whoop and ran in for his gun... the warriors ran to meet the English, the rest fled to save their lives. Moulton, instead of suffering his men to fire at random

---

<sup>7</sup> Penhallow, The History of the Wars of New England, 86-7.

<sup>8</sup> Penhallow, The History of the Wars of New England, 121-2.

through the wigwams, charged every man not to fire, upon pain of death, until the Indians had discharged their guns. It happened as he expected; in their surprise they overshot the English, and not a man was hurt. The English then discharged in their turn, and made great slaughter, but every man still kept his rank. The Indians then fired a second volley, and immediately fled towards the river. ...they made the best of their way to the River, where they had about 40 Canoes; we followed them so close that they put off, without their Paddles, not having time to take them; we then presently beat them out of their Canoes, Killing the greatest part of them; the River being about 60 Yards over and Shallow, our Men followed them over...with such fury, that but one of their Canoes arrived upon the other side, but others Waded and Swam over, so that we judge about 50 Men, Women and Children got over....

We then returned to the Town, where we found Monsieur Ralle the Jesuit, their chief Commander, in one of the Indians houses, who had been continually firing upon a Party of our Men, that were still in the Town: the said Ralle having Wounded one of our people, Lieut. Jaques soon Stove open the door of said house, and found him loading his Gun, who upon Jaques's coming in, Declared Voluntarily, That he would give no

quarter, nor take any; Jaques hearing that, and seeing him loading, shot him thro' the head.<sup>9</sup>

Harmon reported that the Indians initially "stood their ground 4 or 5 minutes" before they broke for the river.<sup>10</sup> The resulting pursuit across the river probably did not last longer than fifteen or twenty minutes.

If both sides survived the opening attack, physically and psychologically, it was not uncommon for fire fights of several hours to develop. In fact, combat on the northern frontier either resolved itself very quickly or persisted for several hours. In 1688, the initial confrontation between soldiers and Indians at North Yarmouth over prisoners resulted in a fire fight ended only by darkness.<sup>11</sup> In July, 1960 a scouting party tracking an Indian raiding party

---

<sup>9</sup> Fannie Eckstorm, "The Attack on Norridgewock: 1724," New England Quarterly, (1934), 568; see also Thomas Hutchinson, The History of the Colony and Province of Massachusetts Bay (London, 1768; reprint Cambridge, MA, 1936), 235-7.

<sup>10</sup> Charles Edward Banks, History of York, Maine (Boston, 1931-35), Vol. I, 326-7.

<sup>11</sup> Tensions in North Yarmouth had been building long before this incident. One soldier hit an Indian with an ax when the Indian refused to release a prisoner. Both sides began firing and the Englishmen retreated to a river bank where they continued the fight for the remainder of the day. Toward evening the English commander, Captain Walter Gendal, was mortally wounded as he crossed the river in a canoe to bring his men more ammunition. See Cotton Mather, Decennium Luctuosum (1699, reprinted in Charles H. Lincoln, ed., Narratives of the Indian Wars, 1675-1699, New York, 1913), 191; William Hutchison Rowe, Ancient North Yarmouth and Yarmouth, Maine, 1636-1936 (Yarmouth, ME, 1937)

caught them near Wheelwright pond in present day Lee, New Hampshire. The fight lasted most of the day and resulted in the death of one of the captains and fourteen other provincial soldiers.<sup>12</sup> When John March and Daniel King's men were ambushed on the beach at Maquoit bay the following year, resulting in the death of Captain Samuel Sherbourne, the survivors retreated to their sloops which were grounded by low tide. The Indians then kept up a fire fight with the sloops most of the night.<sup>13</sup>

Lovewell's last battle is the most memorable extended engagement. Early on the morning of May 8, 1725, John Lovewell and his men heard a gunshot nearby, and upon investigating, found a lone Indian hunting. In an exchange of fire the Indian was killed and Lovewell and another man wounded. On returning to their packs sometime around ten o'clock, they walked into an ambush. Lovewell, Lieutenants Josiah Farwell and Jonathan Robbins, and several others fell mortally wounded on the first fire, but the provincial soldiers maintained their composure, returned the fire and, under the leadership of Ensign Seth Wyman, regrouped along the shore of a pond. The battle settled down into a fire fight which continued for ten hours until the Indians

---

<sup>12</sup> Jeremy Belknap, The History of New Hampshire (Reprint of 1831 edition, New York, 1970), Vol 1, 134.

<sup>13</sup> Mather, Decennium Luctuosum in Lincoln, ed., Narratives of the Indian Wars, 229.

finally withdrew, leaving the survivors of Lovewell's command to make their best way home.<sup>14</sup>

The length of such encounters, and the frequency of firing, was limited by ammunition supplies and loading procedures. The militia requirement of "one pound of powder, twenty bullets fit for his gun, and twelve flints" would be considered a minimum amount and probably reflects the ammunition carried by members of alarm lists engaged in pursuits.<sup>15</sup> But provincial soldiers involved in scouting and expeditions carried anywhere from thirty to sixty ball, either loose or, more commonly, wrapped with the powder in cartridges. Larger amounts than this presented problems in transportation. British style shoulder cartridge boxes of the period were made to carry eighteen cartridges, which was frequently augmented by a waistbelt box containing another eighteen cartridges for a total of thirty-six rounds. If made for a 10 bore British musket, the thirty-six cartridges would weigh approximately four pounds, not including the weight of the cartridge boxes themselves. Added to the weight of musket, knapsack filled with spare clothes and blanket, hatchet or hunting sword, and food, thirty-six

---

<sup>14</sup> Penhallow, History of the Wars of New England, 112-7; Belknap, History of New Hampshire, 210; George W. Chamberlain, "John Chamberlain, The Indian Fighter at Pigwacket," Collections and Proceedings of the Maine Historical Society, Second Series, Vol. IX; George Hill Evans, Pigwacket (Somerville, MA, 1939), 64-66.

<sup>15</sup> "Act for Regulating the Militia, 1693," Background of Selective Service (Washington, 1947), Vol II, Massachusetts Militia Laws, 139.

cartridges represented a reasonable limit for traveling through the woods. The number of rounds could be increased without adding to the weight by reducing the bore size of the muskets. Thus a soldier using a 16 bore ball could carry twelve more cartridges than a soldier using a 12 bore ball with no increase in weight, which is why smaller caliber fusils and hunting arms were preferred by provincial soldiers.<sup>16</sup>

Soldiers with fewer than thirty rounds soon depleted their ammunition in any sustained action. For example, at Quebec in 1690, when French soldiers opposed their landing, the New Englanders drove off the enemy and chased them for several miles. "Our Men had spent the greatest part of our Ammunition in this skirmish," Thomas Savage reported, "having taken ashore with them about three quarters of a Pound of Powder a Man, and about fifteen or eighteen Shot." Savage was unimpressed with the resupply efforts, as the ships sent a "half a Barrel of Powder, which what that was

---

<sup>16</sup> See chapter on weapons for more. The French and Indians also tended to use smaller caliber weapons whenever possible. The Frenchman captured after the raid on Salmon Falls in 1690 said he and his fellow soldiers carried two pounds of powder and sixty bullets each when they left Canada. French raiding parties often expected to hunt for their provisions which may explain the high number of rounds. See "French Captive Examination from Piscataway Co., March 19, 1690," James Phinney Baxter, ed., Documentary History of the State of Maine (Portland, ME, 1897), Collections of the Maine Historical Society, 2nd Series, Vol. V, 55-56.



you may judge, amongst near 1200 Men."<sup>17</sup> Benjamin Church had experienced similar problems a year earlier when the men under his command were thrust into the Battle of Brackett's Woods at Falmouth, Maine with no chance to fill their cartridge boxes or pouches. When Church "ordered that all his army should pursue the enemy ... they told him that most of them had spent their ammunition; that if the enemy had engaged them a little longer, they might have come and knocked them on the head."<sup>18</sup>

The Eastern Indians were handicapped by ammunition supply as well. Samuel Penhallow thought the reason the Pequawkets gave up the fight with Lovewell's men might have been "Want of Ammunition." Cotton Mather believed the long fire fight with men under John March and Daniel King in their beached sloops wasted the Indians ammunition which kept them from attacking the Isle of Shoals as they originally intended.<sup>19</sup> In such cases a long fight, no matter what the tactical outcome, became a strategic victory by reducing the ability of the enemy to wage war.

---

<sup>17</sup> "Thomas Savage to his brother in England, 1691," (London, 1691), in Collections of the Massachusetts Historical Society, Series II, Vol. 3, 257.

<sup>18</sup> Thomas Church, The History of the Great Indian War of 1675 and 1676 Commonly called Philip's War, also, The Old French and Indian Wars, from 1689 to 1704 (Hartford, Conn, 1845 edition, orig. pub. 1716), 170. This is the battle where Church found that his spare ammunition was the wrong caliber. See Chapter Six.

<sup>19</sup> Mather, Decennium Luctuosum in Lincoln, ed., Narratives of the Indian Wars, 229.

In addition to ammunition supplies, loading procedures limited the length and intensity of engagements. English regulars were expected to load and fire their muskets every fifteen to twenty seconds on the drill field, but under the stress of combat two shots per minute was considered good, especially before the practice of priming from a cartridge became common in the 1730's.<sup>20</sup> Provincials were not introduced to priming from a cartridge, which eliminated the extra steps involved in using a powder horn or flask to prime the pan, until the 1740's.<sup>21</sup> Even then, the use of powder horns for priming remained widespread. In addition, extended firing increased the accumulation of powder fouling in the barrels which would eventually interfere with ramming, and slow the whole procedure.

Thus a loading speed of two shots per minute under combat conditions would be considered very good, even unusual. Such a rate of fire impressed Captain Eleazer

---

<sup>20</sup> Sylvia Frey, The British Soldier in America: A Social History of Military Life in the Revolutionary Period (Austin, TX, 1981), 100-1; J. A. Houlding, Fit For Service: The Training of the British Army, 1715-95 (Oxford, 1981), 147-8. Actually, British soldiers could not achieve a loading rate of four shots per minute until both the priming flask was eliminated and the wooden ramrod replaced by a metal one. This rate refers to drill as well, commonly done with blanks, and not combat conditions.

<sup>21</sup> Troops heading to Louisbourg were ordered "to make a form suitable to his gun and to choose out bullets suitable and to make as many cartridges as to fill their cartouch boxes with powder and ball and to allow as much powder in each cartridge as will be sufficient to prime too." See American Antiquarian Society, Curwen Family Papers, Box 3, Folder 1.

Melvin enough for him to make a note of it in his scouting report. In May, 1748, Melvin led a scout from Fort Dummer to the area around the French fort at Crown Point. While watching Lake Champlain a canoe containing twelve Indians came within view. "Apprehending we might make some spoil upon them, and fearing we should have no better opportunity, we agreed to fire upon them, and accordingly fired six times each in about 3 or 4 minutes."<sup>22</sup>

Short cuts in the procedure could produce quicker loading times. One method was to seat the ball on the powder by thumping the butt of the musket on the ground rather than using a ramrod.<sup>23</sup> The thumping also forced powder through the flash hole into the pan thus eliminating the need for priming.<sup>24</sup> The legendary story concerning the death of the Pequawket chief Paugus during Lovewell's fight illustrates the advantages of this method. During the

---

<sup>22</sup> "Eleazer Melvin's Journal," New Hampshire Historical Society.

<sup>23</sup> Frey, The British Soldier in America, 101; See also David Howarth, Waterloo: Day of Battle (New York, 1968), 59-60, for reference to British soldiers using this method during the Napoleonic wars. I feel it necessary to point out that this is a dangerous practice condoned only in the life threatening situation of battle. If the ball does not seat properly on the powder, the barrel may explode from the pressure.

<sup>24</sup> Plains Indian used this technique when reloading their flintlock trade guns on horse back, because sprinkling powder in a small pan on the back of a galloping horse is not practical. (See Charles E. Hanson, Jr., The Northwest Gun (Lincoln, Nebraska, 1955), 1) When priming powder was taken from the cartridge, the weapon was prime first and the rest of the powder poured down the barrel, but when priming from horn or flask, the priming was done last.

course of the fire fight, John Chamberlain's weapon became fouled with powder residue and he withdrew to the pond to clean it. While there he saw Paugus performing the same duty nearby. Apparently Chamberlain knew Paugus personally and issued a challenge to him which was accepted. Both men began to reload but Chamberlain, "trusting to the priming of his gun by a thump on the ground," finished first and took careful aim while Paugus was priming from his horn. Chamberlain's ball killed Paugus as he was in the act of aiming.<sup>25</sup>

However, despite these incidents, firing during an extended fight tended to be slow and deliberate, both to conserve precious supplies of ammunition and to make every ball count if possible. Samuel Penhallow reported that after the fall of Lovewell, "Ensign Wyman took upon him the command of the shattered Company, who behaved himself with great Prudence and Courage, by animating the Men and telling them, 'that the Day would yet be their own, if their Spirits did not flag'; which enlivened them anew, and caused them to fire so briskly, that several discharged between twenty and thirty times apiece."<sup>26</sup> Over the course of a ten hour battle this means an average firing rate of one shot every twenty minutes.

---

<sup>25</sup> Chamberlain, "John Chamberlain," Colls and Proc. Me. Hist. Soc., Second Series, Vol. IX, 8.

<sup>26</sup> Penhallow, History of the Wars of New England, 114.

Of course this is an average rate. Evidence seems to indicate that the intensity of battle fluctuated with periods of furious firing interspersed with lulls.<sup>27</sup> One reason for the lulls beyond the need to catch a breath or clean a weapon, was to let the gun smoke dissipate so the enemy could be seen. Black powder produces a white cloud of sulphurous smelling smoke which reduced visibility if not blown away by a breeze. The volume of smoke produced on European battle fields was known to envelope armies and even obliterate the sun. But even in the relative small engagements on the northern frontier powder smoke hampered aim and reduced the rate of fire.<sup>28</sup> During a running fight between a fishing shallop and several canoes filled with Indians, the English, according to Samuel Penhallow, "spent five pounds of Powder, and when the Enemy ceased their chase, they had not one quarter of a pound left. ... The number of

---

<sup>27</sup> Chamberlain, "John Chamberlain," Colls and Proc. Me. Hist. Soc., Second Series, Vol. IX, 8.

<sup>28</sup> I have participated in a mock battle with muzzle loading weapons in wooded terrain involving numbers similar to Lovewell's last fight. It had rained the night before and the air was still heavy with moisture when the action began. After only two or three shots we found ourselves suddenly isolated in a thick blanket of smoke. The damp air and the foliage reduced the movement of air, holding the smoke in place. It swirled around us as we moved forward, so thick it seemed almost to be a liquid. Firing slackened immediately as it was difficult to tell friend from foe, the enemy appearing only as shadowy forms among the trees. In fact, two men were "shot" by their own comrades during the advance due to mistaken identity.

[Indians] that fell was then unknown, because of a continued Cloud of Smoke."<sup>29</sup>

In addition to musket fire and smoke, combat was punctuated by sound of shouting and yelling. Soldiers shouted encouragement and information to each other throughout the heat of battle. Like Seth Wyman at Lovewell's fight, officers in particular yelled encouragements to keep up the spirits of their men. The story related by Cotton Mather about the inhabitants of Gloucester and some French and Indian raiders gives a feeling for this type of communication in combat. On July 14, 1692 six of the enemy were seen by the residents of one garrison and the men, including one Ebenezer Bapson, sallied out to fight them.

Bapson presently overtook two of them, which run out of the Bushes, and coming close to them, he presented his Gun at them, and his Gun missing fire, the two men Returned into the Bushes. Bapson then called unto the other persons, which were on the other side of the Swamp, and upon his call, they made Answer, "Here they

---

<sup>29</sup> Penhallow, History of the Wars of New England, 46; One veteran of the Continental army remembered the effects of powder smoke well. "[The British] were retreating in line, though in some disorder, I singled out a man and took my aim directly between his shoulders. (They were divested of their packs.) He was a good mark, being a broad-shouldered fellow. What became of him I know not; the fire and smoke hid him from my sight." - Joseph Plumb Martin, Private Yankee Doodle: Being a Narrative of some of the Adventures, Dangers and Sufferings of a Revolutionary Soldier (Originally published in Hallowell, Maine, 1830; Reprint by Eastern Acorn Press of the 1962 Little, Brown and Company edition, George F. Scheer, ed.), 130.

are! Here they are!" Bapson then running to meet them, Saw Three men walk softly out of the Swamp by each other's Side; the middlemost having on a white Waistcoat. So being within Two or Three Rod of them, he Shot, and as soon as his Gun was off, they all fell down. Bapson then running to his supposed prey, cried out unto his Companions, whom he hear on the other side of the Swamp, and said, he had kill'd Three! But coming almost unto them, they all rose up, and one of them Shot at him, and hearing the Bullet whis by him, he ran behind a Tree, and loaded his Gun, and seeing them lye behind a Log, he crept toward them again, telling his Companions, they were here! So, his Companions came up to him, and they all Ran directly to the Log, with all speed; but before they got thither, they saw them start up, and run every man his way; One of them run into the Corn, whom they pursued, and hemm'd in; and Bapson seeing him coming toward himself, Shot at him, as he was getting over the Fence, and saw him fall off the Fence on the Ground, but when he came to the Spot, he could not find him.<sup>30</sup>

---

<sup>30</sup> Mather, Decennium Luctuosum in Lincoln, ed., Narratives of the Indian Wars, 243-7. The inability of the Gloucester men to shoot any of these raiders convinced them they were actually specters. For example, at one point "Bapson went into the Woods, after his Catt<sup>l</sup>, and saw Three men stand upon a point of Rocks, which look'd toward the Sea. So he crept among the Bushes, till he came within Forty yards of them: and then presented his Gun at them, and Snapt, but his Gun miss'd Fire, and so it did above a Dozen Times, till they all Three came up towards him, walking a slow pace, one of

Soldiers also shouted, yelled and screamed inarticulate war cries during the heat of battle. As Richard Holmes observed, "war cries are a time-honoured means of boosting one's own fighting spirit and attempting to diminish the enemy's."<sup>31</sup> When the French ambushed the provincial soldiers landing below Quebec in 1690, the New Englanders "Shouting and rushing upon the Enemy at once they run away as fast as [their] legs could carry them."<sup>32</sup> During fights on the frontier, both red men and white added their cries to the din of battle. In 1722, the Eastern Indians captured a few fishing vessels at Canso. According to Samuel Penhallow, one captain sent to recapture the ships kept most of his men below decks as he approached a prize ship filled with Indians. "The Indians being flushed with Success, and

---

them having a Gun upon his Back. Nor did they take any more Notice of him, than just to give him a Look; though he snapt his Gun at them, all the while they walked toward him; and by him; neither did they quicken their pace at all, but went into a parcel of Bushes, and he saw them no more. When he came home, he snapt his Gun several Times, sometimes with but a few Corns of Powder, and yet it did not once miss Fire." However, specters rarely use real bullets, and one fired at Ebenezer Bapson and dug out of a tree was "still to be seen." Richard Slotkin felt the Gloucester incident was explained away as specters because the New Englanders could not believe the Indians could penetrate that close to Boston. See Richard Slotkin, Regeneration Through Violence: The Mythology of the American Frontier, 1600-1860 (Middletown, CN, 1973), 119.

<sup>31</sup> Richard Holmes, Acts of War: The Behavior of Men in Battle (New York, 1985), 164.

<sup>32</sup> Anon, "Phips Expedition to Canada," Proceedings of the Massachusetts Historical Society, Second Series, Vol. XV, 315.



having thirty nine on board one of the Vessels which they had took, and seeing no more Men on board the English then what was usual, commanded them to strike for that they were their Prize. Unto whom Captain Eliot reply'd that he was hastening to them; and in an instant called his Men on Deck, who fired on them with a loud Huzza, and clapt them on board; which was so surprising a Salutation, that they made a most dreadful yelling."<sup>33</sup> The Indians who attacked and killed Captain Josiah Winslow in 1724 while he was returning to Fort St. George also "made a hideous yelling" according to Penhallow.<sup>34</sup>

Soldiers on both sides also taunted and shouted insults at each other, usually in an attempt to draw the enemy out into the open. Francis Parkman wrote that when they had trouble coming to grips with the French forces outside Quebec in 1690, "the New England men taunted them as cowards who never fight except under cover."<sup>35</sup> Although some historians have interpreted this as an indication the pro-

---

<sup>33</sup> Penhallow, History of the Wars of New England, 92.

<sup>34</sup> Penhallow, History of the Wars of New England, 100. See chapter on Scouting. The Rev. Thomas Symmes captured the essence of this yelling and screaming in his description of Lovewell's fight. "The Fight continu'd very Furious and Obstinate, All towards Night," he wrote, "The Indians Roaring and Yelling and Howling like Wolves, Barking like Dogs, and making all Sorts of Hideous Noises: The English Frequently Shouting and Huzza'ing, as they did after the first Round." See Thomas Symmes, Historical Memoirs of the Battle at Pigwacket, or Lovewell Lament'd (Boston, 1725), vii.

<sup>35</sup> Francis Parkman, Count Frontenac and New France under Louis XIV (Boston, 1896), 277.

vincials still clung to European style warfare, it was no more than goading the French to reveal themselves. According to Cotton Mather's stimulating account of the siege of Storer's garrison in 1692, the Indians used the same taunts. "The Indian replied unto Captain Converse, Being you are so Stout, why don't you come and Fight in the open Field, like a Man, and not Fight in a Garrison, like a Squaw?"<sup>36</sup> Familiarity between New Englanders and the Eastern Indians through trade and other contacts promoted the exchange of insults during battle. According to the legend, John Chamberlain and Paugus knew each other quite well and hurled personal affronts before their dual on the shore.<sup>37</sup> Jeremy Belknap wrote that the Indians invited Lovewell's men to surrender, "holding up ropes, and intimidated them with their yells."<sup>38</sup>

In almost all circumstances, the Indian method of warfare - the hit and run raid, ambush and surprise - governed combat on the northern frontier. "They are extremely skilful in the art of surprizing, and watching the motions of an enemy," according to one description published in 1757, "... they disperse themselves thro' a country singly, or in very small parties, and lie on the lurch, to

---

<sup>36</sup> Mather, Decennium Luctuosum in Lincoln, ed., Narratives of the Indian Wars, 238.

<sup>37</sup> Chamberlain, "John Chamberlain," Colls and Proc. Me. Hist. Soc., Second Series, Vol. IX, 5.

<sup>38</sup> Belknap, History of New Hampshire, 210; Charles E. Clark, The Eastern Frontier: The Settlement of Northern New England, 1610-1763 (New York, 1970), 263.

pick up stragglers, or procure intelligence: in which they act with an astonishing patience and indefatigableness ... remaining in one place, and often in one posture, for whole days and weeks together, till they find an opportunity to strike their stroke, or compass their design, whatever it may be."<sup>39</sup>

One of the few first-hand English observations of Indians preparing and executing an ambush is contained in the report of Caleb Lyman.<sup>40</sup> Acting on intelligence from Albany that the Indians had established a fort on the Connecticut river, Lyman led a scout of five friendly Indians to investigate sometime in May, 1704. Approaching the supposed site of the fort, they halted "to consult what Methods to take; and soon concluded to send out a Spy, with Green Leaves for a Cap and Veste, to prevent his own Discovery, and to find out the Enemy." The scout had no sooner left, however, when they saw two Indians in a canoe

---

<sup>39</sup> State of the British and French Colonies in North America With Respect to Number of People, Forces, Forts, Indians, Trade and Other Advantages (1755, facsimile reprint, New York, 1967), 73-74. As Francis Jennings has pointed out, the North American Indians originally fought in massed bodies before the coming of the white men, but the "introduction of firearms made massed attacks suicidal." The Indians adapted their own hunting techniques to warfare by utilizing the ambush and surprise attack as their primary tactic. Thus, ironically, European technology forced this change which in turn forced the Europeans to change their mode of fighting to match the new style of Indian war. See Francis Jennings, The Invasion of America: Indians, Colonialism and the Cant of Conquest (New York, 1975), 166.

<sup>40</sup> The following account is quoted in Penhallow, History of the Wars of New England, 20-22.

and heard the firing of a gun, Lyman recalled the scout and "concluded to keep close till Sunset."

At Sunset, Lyman and his five Indians moved down to the river where they saw smoke from a camp fire. With "utmost Care and Diligence" they worked their way to within twelve rods of the enemy's wigwam.

But here we met with a new Difficulty, which we feared would have ruined the whole Design: For the Ground was so covered over with dry Sticks and Brush, for the space of five Rods, that we could not pass, without making such a *Crackling*, as we thought would alarm the Enemy, and give them Time to escape. But while we were contriving to compass our Design, God in his good Providence so ordered, that a very *small* Cloud arose, which gave a smart *Clap of Thunder*, and a sudden Shower of Rain. And this Opportunity we embraced, to run thorow the Thicket; and so come undiscovered within sight of the *Wigwam*; and perceived by their Noise, that the Enemy were awake. But however, being unwilling to lose any Time, we crept on our Hands and Knees till we were within three or four Rods of them. Then we arose, and ran to the side of the *Wigwam*, and fired in upon them: And flinging down our Guns, we surrounded them with our *Clubs* and *Hatchets*, and knockt down several we met with.<sup>41</sup>

---

<sup>41</sup> There were nine Indians in the wigwam. Two escaped, although Lyman reported he heard one was mortally

Although accounts of the preparation are rare, the impact of the surprise attacks is well known. According to John Gyles' clear description of the attack on Pemaquid in August, 1689, the men had worked in the fields all morning, stopped to eat, then went back to work, dividing into groups among the various fields. The fort fired the signal cannon and Gyles' father said he hoped the news was good, "But to our great surprise, about thirty or forty Indians at that moment discharged a volley of shot at us from behind a rising ground near our barn. The yelling of the Indians, the whistling of their shot, and the voice of my father, whom I heard cry out, 'What now! What now!' so terrified me (though he seem to be handing a gun) that I endeavored to make my escape. My brother ran one way, and I another, and looking over my shoulder I saw a stout fellow, all painted, pursuing me, with a gun in one hand and a cutlass glittering in the other, which I expected in my brains every moment."<sup>42</sup> When Gyles tripped, the Indian tied him up and led him to

---

wounded. Of the seven killed outright, Lyman and his Indians scalped six and left the seventh unscalped. "Our Indians saying, They would give one to the Country, since we each of us one; and so concluded we should all be rich enough."

<sup>42</sup> Samuel Adams Drake, The Border Wars of New England, Commonly called King William's and Queen Anne's Wars (1897, reprint of 1910 edition, Williamstown, MA, 1973), 31.

where the other prisoners were being gathered before being taken into a long captivity.<sup>43</sup>

The Indians relied on this scattering effect, and the psychological paralysis induced by sudden shock, to give them a quick and easy victory. Flushed like so many quail, the enemy, isolated and terrified, would be dispatched with tomahawk or knife as the Indian muskets had been discharged in the initial attack. However, despite the romantic descriptions provided by Hollywood, novelists and even historians, hand to hand combat between two equally prepared opponents during the French and Indian wars was an extremely rare occurrence. The Eastern Indian involved in or even confronted with such an encounter usually withdrew from the action.<sup>44</sup>

---

<sup>43</sup> Gyles' father was mortally wounded. Apparently, the Indian chief in command, Moxus, knew the elder Gyles and expressed regret at his wounding. Moxus "told him that those were strange Indians who shot him, and that he was sorry for it. My father replied that he was a dying man, and wanted no favor but to pray with his children [which was allowed]... He parted from us with a cheerful voice, but looked very pale, by reason of his great loss of blood, which now gushed out his shoes. The Indians then led him aside. I heard the blows of the hatchets, but neither shriek nor groan."

This scattering effect was a common reaction to a surprise attack. During the assault on Salmon Falls in March, 1690, "the enemy made their onset between break of the day and sunrise -- when most were a bed and no watch kept neither in fort nor house they presently took possession of the fort to prevent any of ours doing it and so carried all before then by a surprize, none of our men being able to get together into a body to oppose them." See "Letter from William Vaughn and Richard Martyn to the Governor and Council, March 19, 1690," Baxter, ed., Doc. Hist. Me., Vol. V, 57.

<sup>44</sup> Harold L. Peterson, Arms and Armor in Colonial America, 1526-1783 (Harrisburg, Penn., 1956), 7. It should be

When the Indians broke into the bedroom of Richard Waldron during the attack on Dover, New Hampshire in 1689, the octogenarian Indian fighter grabbed his sword to defend himself. The Indians reportedly retreated through two rooms before the wrath of the old warrior, and only subdued him when he turned his back to fetch his other weapons.<sup>45</sup> In July, 1705, twenty troopers under a Captain Rowley returned from a patrol to refresh themselves at a garrison in Dunstable. While they were eating and drinking, a large force of Indians burst in upon them. Unable to reach their weapons, the soldiers grabbed chairs and anything else that lay handy and drove the Indians out of the house.<sup>46</sup>

Two years earlier, during the general assault on Maine communities on August 10, the Indians tried subterfuge in their attack on the fort at Falmouth. Three chiefs advanced toward the fort with a flag of truce and asked for a parley. the commander, John March, suspected a trap but went out to meet them anyway, taking the two oldest men in the community with him. As was customary, the whitemen were unarmed, and as they approached the three chiefs, the Indians pulled

---

emphasized that the sources describing Indian war combat are all white accounts, many of which have undoubtedly been exaggerated or altered by time. Although a few examples are given, the conclusions presented here are based on an overall impression covering sixty years of warfare, not on any particular incident.

<sup>45</sup> Belknap, History of New Hampshire, 127-8; Drake, The Border Wars of New England, 19.

<sup>46</sup> Drake, The Border Wars of New England, 218; Penhallow, History of the Wars of New England, Notes, 11-13. Ten of the troopers died, probably in the first assault.

tomahawks out of their blankets and attacked. The two old men were easily killed, but John March wrested the hatchet from his opponent and held the three chiefs at bay until help came from the fort.<sup>47</sup>

Lovewell's fight against the Eastern Indians is often described with glowing accounts of hand to hand combat as well. Historian John K. Mahon wrote that the "Indians deviated from the usual pattern by breaking cover and rushing in mass toward the whites. Then, after volleying at one another in the open, both sides closed in and grappled hand to hand."<sup>48</sup> However, there is no indication any hand to hand fighting took place during the battle. When Lovewell's men did not scatter at the first volley, and actually advanced, the Indians were content to use fire power to beat the whitemen. There was no wild melee, no swinging hatchet and musket butt, just a fire fight.<sup>49</sup>

---

<sup>47</sup> Penhallow, History of the Wars of New England, 5-7. Of the two old men, Penhallow said "They had scarce Blood enough left to tinge the Knife of the Sacrifice." It is obvious that March took the most expendable men with him.

<sup>48</sup> John K. Mahon, "Anglo-American Methods of Indian Warfare, 1676-1794" Mississippi Valley Historical Review, 45 (1958), 260.

<sup>49</sup> Penhallow said Lovewell's men advanced "to within twice the length of their Guns." The Indians had rushed out as part of the surprise tactic while the whites charged, but no contact was made (see below). As further testimony of the absences of hand to hand combat, the few descriptions of wounds suffered by the whites show only evidence of gunshots, not edged weapons. See Penhallow, History of the Wars of New England, 113.



This aversion to hand to hand combat was noticed and misinterpreted as cowardice by both contemporary New Englanders and some subsequent historians. Cotton Mather exhorted communities on the frontier to maintain their watching and warding, because they faced a "Mischievous Enemy; but a cowardly one. The Cowards never durst Assault you, but when they can surprize you. Though they have come Three or Four Hundred miles to molest you, yet if they find you Awake when they come, away they Go again."<sup>50</sup> Jeremy Belknap observed that the Indians "appeared not in the open field, nor gave proofs of a truly masculine courage."<sup>51</sup> And Herbert M. Sylvester, writing around the turn of the twentieth century, believed "the Indians were natural cowards. They fought from ambush or shielded themselves behind the log fences along the field-side; from stumps and trees; never for a moment remaining quiet when in the open; trusting to their numbers and the terror of their yells and sudden appearance to paralyze their intended victims with fear. ... They were brave at braining babes and women, but a man with a gun and a reputation for courage would put a score of savages to their heels."<sup>52</sup>

Indian behavior in battle, as well as the interpretation of that behavior as cowardice, illustrates the differ-

---

<sup>50</sup> Cotton Mather, Frontiers Well-Defended (Boston, 1707), 22.

<sup>51</sup> Belknap, History of New Hampshire, 145.

<sup>52</sup> Herbert Milton Sylvester, Indian Wars of New England (Boston, 1910), Vol. III, 393.

ences between European and native American cultures. John Keegan and Richard Holmes wrote that "fighting in primitive warfare takes a form quite other than that known in 'advanced' societies. Much of it is of a low-level endemic quality - ambush and raiding.... Since there is no intention to win, however, the fighting is conducted at long distances, usually with missiles, and casualties few.... A death, even a serious wounding, is normally the signal for the battle to be brought to an end and overtures of peace to be initiated."<sup>33</sup> Francis Jennings agreed with this assessment. He found that Indian warfare produced far fewer casualties than "civilized" warfare, and that, on the whole, European society was far more violent than its native American counterpart.<sup>34</sup>

In Primitive War: Its Practice and Concepts, Harry Turney-High wrote that the prime motive of the American Indian was individual glory, that honor went to the individual, not the village or the tribe.<sup>35</sup> The Eastern

<sup>33</sup> Keegan and Holmes, Soldiers, 206.

<sup>34</sup> Jennings, Invasion of America, 150, 147.

<sup>35</sup> Harry H. Turney-High, Primitive War: Its Practice and Concepts (Columbus, SC, 1949), 147; Douglas Leach agreed with this assessment that primitive warfare was for individuals, see The Northern Colonial Frontier, 1607-1763 (New York, 1966), 12. Leroy V. Eid attacked this notion somewhat by insisting Indians were capable of a "national war." Eid meant that large war parties were dispatched after discussions by leading chiefs. Eid may be correct as the Eastern Indians certainly were able to put together large war parties, but the individual motivation of the warriors, and their behavior in battle, did not differ remarkably from smaller raiding parties. See Leroy V. Eid, "'National'

Indian also took with him the handicaps and burdens of wilderness living. As a hunting society whose numbers were relatively small, every male played an important role in the support of their families and village. Death or a debilitating wound diminished the ability of the family and the tribe to provide food, and unlike their white adversaries, the Indians had no governments to petition for pensions or relief to compensate for death or disability.

Thus the Eastern Indian and the New England provincial soldier entered battle with different cultural and social pressures. Someone once wrote that the difference between red men and white men in war is that white men entered battle believing that someone else would get killed or wounded. The fear of death was there, but down deep the European resisted the idea that he would be wiped out of existence. The Indian, on the other hand, entered battle feeling he would be the one hit. The basic optimism of European culture verses the pessimism of native American culture accounts for their different approach to combat.<sup>56</sup>

Perhaps this pessimism explains the repeated instances where Indians refused to approach provincials who appeared prepared and ready to fire on them. On numerous occasions individuals in garrison houses saved their lives by giving

---

War Among Indians of Northeastern North America"  
Canadian Review of American Studies, XVI (1985), 127-9.

<sup>56</sup> I read that analysis about fifteen years ago in a book about the western Indian wars, and while this particular thought stayed with me, the author and the title did not. A diligent search has so far failed to produce the source.

the appearance of preparedness and strength by shouting commands to imaginary defenders or thrusting unloaded and useless weapons out the loopholes.<sup>57</sup> In April, 1747 three boys uncovered an party of Indians who had laid an ambush for some men working in a nearby field. The Indians fired prematurely and one of he boys returned the fire wounding an Indian. The other boy aimed his weapon but did not fire it, which kept the Indians at bay until the men arrived to drive them off.<sup>58</sup>

Similarly, John Butland of Kennebunk, Maine found himself beset by five Indians while he was searching for his cow in the woods. Butland crawled into a large tree trunk lying nearby. The Indians eventually realized he was in the log, but none of them would look in, or even fire into it, which might expose their arms, because they did not know which way Butland was pointing his gun. They beat on the log, and tried to turn it over, but they refused to approach either open end. Signal guns finally convinced them to leave.<sup>59</sup>

The most famous example of Indian prudence involved the family of Hannah Dustan. The story of how Hannah Dustan was taken captive from her home in Haverhill, then killed and scalped her captors, is legendary, but the adventures of her husband, Thomas, are less well known. At the first sign of

---

<sup>57</sup> See Chapter Two for examples.

<sup>58</sup> Belknap, History of New Hampshire, 293.

<sup>59</sup> Sylvester, Indian Wars of New England, Vol. III, 394-5.

the attack on March 15, 1697, Dustan rode to his cabin from the fields and told his eight children to run for the nearest garrison. His wife had just given birth and was sick in bed, so Dustan made the hard decision to abandon his wife in order to save the children. Mounting his horse, he galloped after them.

The Indians easily caught up with the fleeing Dustan family whose speed was inhibited by the short legs of the younger children. "Dustan well knew that the savages would not venture within gun-shot until they had first drawn his fire," wrote the nineteenth century historian Samuel Adams Drake, "Urging his little flock to quicken their pace, he wheeled his horse and levelled his gun at the nearest pursuers, who instantly halted expecting a shot. Dustan, however, knew better than to throw his only chance away. He kept the Indians covered with his gun until the children had widen the distance between them, then coolly rode back to rejoin them."<sup>60</sup> Dustan continued to point his loaded weapon at the Indians who halted and dove for cover until his family made it safely to a garrison. The Indians tried random shots at the horseman, but eventually gave up the chase.

It is conceivable that a party of Europeans in a similar situation would have simply rushed Dustan in the belief that he could only shoot one of them, with each individual thinking, and hoping, that in all probability it

---

<sup>60</sup> Drake, The Border Wars of New England, 119.

would be someone else. Certainly Lovewell and his men showed no hesitation in approaching the lone Indian just before their fateful battle, a confrontation which resulted in the death of the Indian and the wounding of Lovewell and another man. However, the Eastern Indian calculated the odds of survival differently than the European. They tried to gauge the effects of their surprise on the enemy and withdrew when the advantage disappeared. Believing in the axiom it is better to "run away and live to fight another day", they preferred long distance fire fights to close hand to hand combat because it was easier to disengage from the former if the tide turned against them. Therefore, Francis Jennings' observation that "there were no innate differences between Indians and Europeans in their capacity for war or their mode of conducting it" is not strictly true.<sup>61</sup> Their capacity for war may have been similar, but the tactical conduct of battle revealed subtle cultural distinctions.

In the late 1950's, John K. Mahon wrote an article analyzing the "Anglo-American Methods of Indian Warfare."<sup>62</sup> Covering the period from King Philip's War to Anthony Wayne's expedition against the Indians in the Ohio Valley in 1794, Mahon emphasized the Indian tactic of surprise achieved by means of ambush, and recalled British general Henry Bouquet's description of the Indian in battle.

---

<sup>61</sup> Jennings, Invasion of America, 168.

<sup>62</sup> Mahon, "Anglo-American Methods," Miss. Va. Hist. Rev., Vol. 45 (1958), 254-75.

According to Bouquet, the Indians fought in scattered formation during a fire fight, trying to surround their enemy, giving ground when pressed and returning when the pressure ceased. Mahon concluded that the secret to fighting Indians was coordinated movement and the use of the bayonet. "American militiamen, many of whom were practiced marksmen and few of whom knew how to handle a bayonet, naturally preferred to rely on marksmanship."<sup>63</sup> This involved provincials in inconclusive fire fights which often produced as many white casualties as Indian. Provincial weapons - fowlers, rifles and trade guns - could not mount a bayonet, and thus were "disqualified for effective use in the type of Indian fighting that depended upon shock action rather than weapons-fire to inflict destructive defeats."

Henry Bouquet used coordinated movement and the bayonet to defeat the Indians at the Battle of Bushy Run during Pontiac's Rebellion in 1763, and at the end of the century, Anthony Wayne ordered his men to "Rouse" the Indians with the bayonet, fire at their backs, and charge again to prevent them from reloading. Therefore, the bayonet "became a decisive weapon in organized Indian fighting," and, as "only disciplined bodies of soldiers could make effective use of them," the true hero of the Indian wars was the "trained regular soldiery, first the redcoats and then their American counterparts, were more important than unorganized

---

<sup>63</sup> Mahon, "Anglo-American Methods," Miss. Va. Hist. Rev., Vol. 45 (1958), 271.

frontiersmen in breaking the power of the Indians."<sup>64</sup> Unfortunately, Mahon's thesis is flawed because he has misinterpreted the evidence. It was not the bayonet which was so effective, but the tactic of charging itself.

Provincial soldiers adopted many Indian tactics during the course of their long wars, especially the surprise and ambush. Scouting companies were ordered to "be silent in their Marches, and patient and vigilant in their waiting for the Enemy, that if it be possible they make a Discovery of themselves by their [musket] Fires, but to be sure not by Shooting or other Noises."<sup>65</sup> At Norridgewock in 1724, Jeremiah Moulton ordered his men to "advance softly, and to keep a profound silence" as they approached the Indian village.<sup>66</sup> The following year a scout commanded by John Lovewell discovered a party of ten Indians camped near a pond in present day Wakefield, New Hampshire.<sup>67</sup> Lovewell prepared his ambush with care. He divided his men into firing teams of five each, then drawing near the sleeping Indians after midnight, he fired his own gun as a signal. Each five man team fired in succession, catching the Indians

---

<sup>64</sup> Mahon, "Anglo-American Methods," Miss. Va. Hist. Rev., Vol. 45 (1958), 257, 255.

<sup>65</sup> "Dummer to Westbrook, March 20, 1724," William Blake Trask, Letters of Colonel Thomas Westbrook and others Relative to Indian Affairs in Maine, 1722-1726 (Boston, 1901), 45.

<sup>66</sup> Eckstorm, "The Attack on Norridgewock: 1724," NEQ, (1934), 568.

<sup>67</sup> Now known as Lovell's Pond.



in various stages of reaction, and destroying the whole party.<sup>68</sup>

Such surprise tactics were used successfully on numerous other occasions, and in their practice differed little from Indian usage.<sup>69</sup> Provincial soldiers also adopted the Indian custom of using cover and fighting in scattered or extended formation. But the battlefield tactics of the New Englanders and the Eastern Indians differed in one important respect. When on the receiving end of an ambush provincial soldiers, if they survived the initial effects of surprise both physically and psychologically, often rushed at their enemy. In fact, for veterans of frontier warfare, the charge became an automatic response to an ambush, and produced three possible results. The Indians broke and fled, or the provincials were stopped by superior forces, in which case they scattered themselves and headed for home, or both sides settled down into a long fire fight.<sup>70</sup>

Provincial soldiers used the charge because of the Indians' aversion to hand to hand combat. In Souldiers

---

<sup>68</sup> One Indian managed to escape momentarily, but was seized by a dog. Belknap, History of New Hampshire, 208.

<sup>69</sup> Turney-High observed that for all their use of surprise tactics, American Indians rarely took steps to prevent a surprise attack on themselves. See Primitive War, 116.

<sup>70</sup> Indians rarely pursued provincial soldiers for very long, fearing the individual might have reloaded and that they would lose their share of the plunder from the battlefield.

Conselled and Comforted, Cotton Mather encouraged soldiers to attack boldly when confronted with Indians. "Your Enemies have made themselves notorious for this quality [of running away]... it is easier to kill them then to find them; so they can rarely Take any but a shaking Trembling Aim at one that boldly faces them ... [so] at the first Appearance of the Tawney Pagans, then Courage! brave Hearts; Fall on!"<sup>71</sup> Benjamin Church frequently ordered a charge when confronted by an enemy force. He had his men charge across a bridge during the Battle of Brackett's Woods in 1689.<sup>72</sup> The following year he and his company chased a force of Indians through their village, and later in the raid would put to flight an enemy party which had ambushed his Plymouth Indians.<sup>73</sup> Church would command similar assaults during his last raid in 1704.<sup>74</sup>

---

<sup>71</sup> Mather, Decennium Luctuosum in Lincoln, ed., Narratives of the Indian Wars, 27-28.

<sup>72</sup> Church, The History of the Great Indian War, 167.

<sup>73</sup> Church, The History of the Great Indian War, 185, 193-5. During the first attack Church would lose his breeches. The second charge involved the lone attack made by Church and James Converse. See Chapter Seven.

<sup>74</sup> Church, The History of the Great Indian War, 267-9. In his description of the incident at Gloucester quoted above, Cotton Mather indicated that Ebenezer Bapson spotted three of the enemy raiders behind a log, and alerted the others in his party. "So, his Companions came up to him, and they all Ran directly to the Log, with all speed; but before they got thither, they saw them start up, and run every man his way." See Mather, Decennium Luctuosum in Lincoln, ed., Narratives of the Indian Wars, 244. The charging tactic could also be used against French rangers. When Phips' soldiers were landing at Quebec in 1690, they charged the enemy force sent to harass the landing, "beat up their Ambuscade,

Of course the tactic did not always work. At Casco Bay in 1690, thirty men sallied out from Fort Loyal to investigate some musket shots. Perceiving their cattle staring at a fence which lined the woods, the company charged the fence with a cheer and were met with a withering volley that killed the lieutenant in command and thirteen others. The survivors ran to a nearby garrison and held off the enemy until dark, when they slipped back into the fort.<sup>75</sup> Lovewell's men also apparently charged after the first shock of the ambush, but meeting obviously superior numbers they retreated to the edge of the pond and began their long fire fight. Francis Parkman emphasized the "unusual" behavior of the Indians during Lovewell's fight "in rushing forward instead of firing from their ambush,"<sup>76</sup> and others, such as John Mahon, have agreed with this interpretation.<sup>77</sup> However, it was not unusual for Indians to rush forward after their initial volley to increase the psychological impact of

---

and followed them a great way." See "Thomas Savage to His Brother," Colls. Mass. Hist. Soc., Series II, Vol. 3, 257.

<sup>75</sup> Mather, Decennium Luctuosum in Lincoln, ed., Narratives of the Indian Wars, 219; Drake, The Border Wars of New England, 50-51. Drake said the Indians rushed out and killed most of the others and only four made it back to the fort that night, however Mather's account, given in the text, seems more reasonable.

<sup>76</sup> Francis Parkman, A Half-century of Conflict (Boston, 1892), 253.

<sup>77</sup> Mahon, "Anglo-American Methods," Miss. Va. Hist. Rev., Vol. 45 (1958), 260. See above.

the surprise attack.<sup>78</sup> The Indians attacking Lovewell followed their usual pattern of firing and rushing forward. If they found the enemy had not scattered or fallen apart, Indians quickly terminated their rush and took cover to continue firing.

But Lovewell's men apparently charged forward themselves after the initial volley, meeting the Indians at close range. The best evidence for this comes from the account of Benjamin Hassell, the man who panicked and left the action to report the premature destruction of the company. When Lt-Governor William Dummer related Hassell's story of Lovewell's wounding and his flight to Colonel Thomas Westbrook, he added that Hassell "Cant Deny but our people were charging the Enemy briskly when he left."<sup>79</sup> There is no reason to suggest Hassell lied in this observation, because it only worsened his own position. Seth Wyman's account, published in the Boston Newsletter a couple of weeks after the battle, also confirms this.

Returning to the Place where they left their Packs, before they could reach it, one of the English discovered an Indian, and calling out to the rest, the Indians rose up from their Ambush, Shouted and fired,

---

<sup>78</sup> For example, see John Gyles' account of the Pemaquid attack above.

<sup>79</sup> "Dummer to Westbrook, May 13, 1725," James Phinney Baxter, ed., Documentary History of the State of Maine (Portland, ME, 1907), Collections of the Maine Historical Society, 2nd Series, Vol. X, 270.

as did the English at the same Instant. ... After the first Fire, the Indians advanc'd with great Fury towards the English, with their Hatchets in their Hands, the English likewise running up to them, till they came within 4 or 5 Yards of the Enemy, and were even mix'd among them, when the Dispute growing too warm for the Indians, they gave back, and endeavour'd to encompass the English, who then retreated to the Pond, in order to have their Rear cover'd, where they continu'd the Fight till Night.<sup>80</sup>

Apparently both sides advanced after the first fire, the Indians as part of their ambush tactic, the whites as the automatic response to Indian attack. As they came "within twice the length of their Guns," the Indians realized the whites had not scattered and remained a cohesive fighting force. Lovewell's men found the Indians were not retreating and obviously outnumbered their small band, especially in light of the casualties they had just suffered. Therefore, they both withdrew and began their fire fight.<sup>81</sup>

---

<sup>80</sup> Boston Newsletter, May 20 to May 27, 1725.

<sup>81</sup> It is perhaps the fact the Indians had not fled when the whites charged that left the impression Indian behavior in that engagement was unusual, but it was only a matter of timing. The whitemen charged before the Indians had completed the surprise phase of their attack.

This automatic impulse to charge the enemy is illustrated in perhaps the most vivid account of combat on the frontier - Eleazer Melvin's journal of his 1748 scout to Crown Point. After Melvin and his men fired on the Indians in the canoe (see above), they heard signal guns at the French fort and so, knowing a pursuit force would soon be sent, started their journey back to Fort Dummer. The next day they crossed the trail of 150-200 tracks obviously belonging to the enemy, and assumed they represented the pursuit force. Melvin and his men followed the banks of Otter Creek, crossed over a mountain range and came upon a branch of the West river.

Our provision being very short, we began our march before sunrise, and travelled till about half after 9 o'clock; being by the side of the river several of the company desired to stop to refresh themselves, being faint and weary, whereupon we halted and began to take off our packs, and some were set down, and in about a half a minute after our halting, the enemy rose from behind a log and several trees, about 20 feet or 30 at farthest distant, and fired about 12 guns at us, but do not know whether any men received any hurt, tho' so near; -- whereupon I called to the men to face the enemy and run up the bank, which I did my self, and several others attempted, but the enemy were so thick, they could not. I was no sooner jump't up the bank but the enemy were just upon me. I discharged my gun at

one of them, about eight feet from the muzzle of my gun, who I see fall, -- and about the same time that I discharged my gun, the enemy fired about 20 guns at us, and killed 4 men ... The men which were left alive most of them fired immediately on the enemy, several of which shots did execution, as can be witnessed by several who see the enemy fall; -- but seeing the enemy numerous and their guns discharged, they retreated. Several ran across the river, where they had some of them opportunity to fire again at the enemy. Some ran up the river, and some down, and some into a thicket on the same side of the river. For my own part, after I saw my men retreat, and being beset by the enemy with guns, hatchets and knives. Several of them attempted to strike at me with their hatchets. Some threw their hatchets, one of which, or a bullet, I cannot certainly tell which, carried away my belt, and with it my bullets, all except one I had loose in my pocket. I ran down the river, and two Indians followed me, and ran almost side by side with me, calling to me, "Come Captain," "Now Captain," but upon my presenting my gun towards them (though not charged) they fell a little back, and I ran across the river, charged my gun, moved a few steps, and one of them fired at me, which was the last gun fired.<sup>82</sup>

---

<sup>82</sup> Melvin Journal, New Hampshire Hist. Soc. After looking for his scattered men, Melvin made his way back to Fort

Most of the elements of frontier combat are contained in this action. The Indians fired on the provincial soldiers from ambush in a classic surprise attack. Eleazer Melvin, who was a veteran of Lovewell's last battle, instantly ordered, and led, a charge up the bank. Melvin encountered an Indian at close range and fired at him with his musket. His men attempted to follow but a second volley, and the obviously superior size of the enemy force, halted their forward motion. The provincial soldiers returned the fire, inflicting casualties on the uncovered Indians, and then with muskets empty, they dispersed to make their escape.

Although momentarily checked by the attempted charge and return fire of the whites, the Indians recognized the odds changing in their favor when they perceived the soldiers scattering. At this point Melvin, who had advanced the farthest, became exposed and vulnerable, and the Indians closed in, throwing knives and hatchets at him as most of their guns had been discharged. Melvin ran down the river bank with two Indians paralleling his course, and taunting him in the hope he would stop his flight. But Melvin kept them at bay by pointing his empty, and useless, musket at them until he crossed the river. The Indians stopped their pursuit at that point, sending a parting shot to speed him on his way. The whole action lasted only a few minutes, and

---

Dummer. Melvin's scout apparently numbered about nineteen or twenty, of whom thirteen survived.



the number of shots fired were very few. Most of the participants fired their weapons only once, with only a few of the whites who crossed the river, and the Indian who fired the last shot at Melvin, getting off a second round.

Melvin's account illustrates the difference in attitude between the Eastern Indians and provincial soldiers. This culturally based difference is subtle, but existed nonetheless. The Indians entered battle with a kind of deep-seated pessimism, and a belief that death brought little glory. Caution and discretion were indeed the better part of valor to the Eastern Indian, and no cultural dishonor resulted from their use. Thus Eleazer Melvin, like Thomas Dustan, was able to fend off his pursuers with a useless gun. In contrast to this, the basic optimism of white culture taught provincial soldiers to exploit the pessimism of the Indian. Therefore, charging the enemy, if physically possible, became an almost automatic response. Certainly Melvin ordered his charge with little reflection or thought.

Mahon's erroneous conclusion that regular soldiers using the bayonet were the most effective Indian fighters in the colonial period is based on a misconception. It was not the bayonet the Indians fled from at Bushy Run and Fallen Timbers, but the charge itself.<sup>83</sup> It was the charge, and

---

<sup>83</sup> Mahon's thesis is furthered weakened by the fact that British regulars, and their American counterparts, never received any training in the use of the bayonet. In his study of British army training, J. A. Houlding found that "bayonet drill was, curiously, rather neg-

the prospect of hand to hand combat, which "roused" the Indians and enabled Anthony Wayne's men to shoot them in the back. This tactic had not been developed by regular troops, British or otherwise, but by provincial soldiers.

The two attitudes, and the impressions produced, are reminiscent of the culture clash between the Americans and the Japanese in the Pacific during World War II. To American observers the Japanese soldier, involved in banzai charges and suicide kamikaze attacks, acted in a manner considered fanatical, even insane. On the other side, the wholesale surrender of American and European soldiers in the opening stages of the war convinced many Japanese leaders that their impressions of Americans as soft, feminine, even cowardly, were all too true.<sup>84</sup> Thus, their apparent reluct-

---

lected in the eighteenth century. Buried away in the manual exercise, it was performed in a most unrealistic fashion; and the command in use -- 'Push your Bayonets!' -- betrays both its origin and underdevelopment. Not until 1805, when Capt. Anthony Gordon published his systematic *Science of Defense*, for the Sword, Bayonet, and Pike in Close Action, was the subject treated in depth by anyone. Many writers lamented this lapse ... [but] from Marlborough's campaigns onwards it was the touch-stone of British Tactical thinking that heavy fire power was all-important; and so it was doctrine perhaps, as much as indifference, that dictated the army's approach" In fact, the only time the British redcoat received specific training in the use of the bayonet was during the Scottish Highland rebellion in 1745, when they faced a foe who charged with sword and shield, preferring hand to hand combat over missile combat. This was a style of fighting the redcoats found unfamiliar and very disconcerting. See Houlding, *Fit for Service*, 261.

<sup>84</sup> For a thorough discussion of Japanese and American attitudes and perceptions, both real and imagined, see John W. Power, *War Without Mercy: Race and Power in the Pacific War* (New York, 1986). In particular see chapters Two, Five and Nine.

ance to engage in close combat convinced provincials that the Indians were cowards, and although few Indian impressions of white behavior in battle exist, if any, it is probable that they viewed the European penchant for charging as impulsive and wasteful.

There is no right or wrong involved in cultural attitudes, they are just different. Combat is a test of wills between two opponents, and in reacting to this test the opposing forces draw on instincts honed by their individual societies and traditions. In the French, New Englanders faced an enemy who may have differed in temperament, politics and religion, but whose basic cultural background was the same. Both were Europeans, and their battles, like Port Royal and Louisbourg, came closest to the European model.

However, in opposing the Eastern Indians, provincial soldiers not only had to face a foe with deep cultural differences, they had to fight that foe on their own terms. Indian warfare dictated the style of combat on the northern frontier. Strategy was simple -- attempt to gain a superior psychological edge through the use of surprise attack. Tactically, the Eastern Indians maximized the effects of surprise by firing, then rushing the foe with hideous yelling. Ideally the enemy would scatter and could be destroyed piecemeal. If they did not scatter, the Indians were content to use overwhelming firepower to wear down their foe in long fire fights. New Englanders adapted to

this warfare by employing the surprise attack themselves, and were more than willing to match the Indians musket for musket in a fire fight. But they also used the charge whenever practical to break up enemy formations and possibly drive off Indian raiding parties. Such a tactic could backfire, but the success rate made the charge an almost automatic response for many veteran soldiers.

While combat on the northern frontier did not approach the vastness and grandeur of European battles, it was just as intense, and just as deadly. Wreathed in powder smoke, ears ringing with musket shots, screams and shouted instructions, provincials soldiers tried to remain tuned to the rhythm of battle. Instantaneous individual decisions had to be made concerning cover, targets and the functioning of weapons, while maintaining group identity for the tactical options of scattering, charging or holding ground. It was a type of combat actually quite familiar to twentieth century soldiers -- small unit action in thick cover depending on individual actions and individual consequences. For provincial soldiers, it was the only form of battle they knew.

## CHAPTER ELEVEN

### THE WOUNDS OF WAR

Beyond all considerations of higher taxes, food shortages, economic disruption, and political upheaval, the final cost of war is measured in the pain of wounds and the finality of death. As in all human conflict, provincial soldiers found that the immediate consequences of combat were dead and wounded comrades, but military service in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries also promoted the spread of deadly disease which, in an age of relatively primitive medical knowledge, led to more deaths than bullets. Understandably, the need for doctors on the frontier and for expeditions was acute, but their numbers were few and in administering to wounded and sick soldiers, New England doctors, finding their supplies and personal stamina exhausted, often succumbed to the very diseases they fought. Their deaths only exacerbating the problem of medical care. The dead were quickly buried, but the wounded had to be cared for, sometimes for extended lengths of time. The medical bills and relief paid to the wounded, as well as compensation for widows and families of the slain, further

complicated the war effort and added to the financial burden of provincial governments.

With hand to hand combat rare, the physical wounds suffered in battle by provincial soldiers usually resulted from gunshots.<sup>1</sup> As wounds in the trunk - in the stomach, bowels or chest - were normally mortal, leg and arm wounds, followed by head wounds, were the most prevalent among survivors. For example, Richard Hunniwell, the Maine woodsman and pilot, reported that he had "been wounded Severall Times in his Arme by divers Shott."<sup>2</sup> John Ellenwood, a Beverly, Massachusetts resident pressed for service on the Maine frontier in 1696, "was sorely wounded in my right hand my fore finger being shott away and the rest of my hand So grevously Shattered and Torn and bones broaken that it hath been thereby rendred almost altogether useless Ever Since."<sup>3</sup> On September 9, 1697, John March and his raiding party were ambushed as they landed near Damariscotta, Maine, and in the

---

<sup>1</sup> The prevalence of gun shot wounds is revealed in the request of a Portsmouth doctor who indicated to the Bay government in January, 1692 that he was "Altogather out of Medicens for gunn shott wounds." He was particularly concerned because the attack on York, Maine had just occurred and he expected either further attacks or that he might be pressed to accompany a pursuit force. He then provided a detailed list of the medicines he needed. See "Dr, Humphrey Bradstreet's Letter, January 26, 1692," James Phinney Baxter, ed., Documentary History of the State of Maine (Portland, ME, 1897), Collections of the Maine Historical Society, 2nd Series, Vol. V, 310-12

<sup>2</sup> "Petition of Richard Honnywell, March 18, 1697," Baxter, ed., Doc. Hist. Me., Vol. V, 477-9.

<sup>3</sup> "John Ellenwood's Petition, February, 1701," Baxter, ed., Doc. Hist. Me., Vol. V, 522-3.

resulting fire fight, twelve provincials were killed and twelve wounded.<sup>4</sup> Among the latter were Eleazer Rogers who was "shott through the Thigh, and through the right side of his head which put out his eye," and Peter Legrove whose "wound was a Large deep wound In his thigh with the Laceration of the Nearves and muscles."<sup>5</sup> Such descriptions would remain consistent throughout the early French wars.<sup>6</sup>

Some extremely fortunate men survived wounds that were normally mortal. Eleazer Davis was wounded in the stomach and had part of a thumb shot off during Lovewell's fight. He somehow managed to remain alive and staggered into

---

<sup>4</sup> Cotton Mather, Decennium Luctuosum (1699, reprinted in Charles H. Lincoln, ed., Narratives of the Indian Wars, 1675-1699, New York, 1913), 268-9.

<sup>5</sup> "Eliezer Rogers' Petition, 1698," Baxter, ed., Doc. Hist. Me., Vol. V, 512; "Certificate of Surgeon Humphrey Bradstreet, December 8, 1697," Baxter, ed., Doc. Hist. Me., Vol. V, 494-5.

<sup>6</sup> In one case the description of a wound was quite clinical, and obviously provided by a surgeon. On "August 25, 1725, deacon field, deacon Childs, and others, were going up to the Green river farms, and were ambushed by the Indians, but they discovered the Indians, and John Wells discharged his gun at an Indian, who fell; the Indians fired at them, and wounded deacon Samuel Field, the ball passing through the right hypocondria, cutting off three plaits of the mysenteria, which hung out of the wound, in length almost two inches, which was cut off even with the body, the bullet passing between the lowest and the next rib, cutting, at its going forth, the lowest rib; his hand being close to the body when the ball came forth, it entered the root of the heel of the thumb, cutting the bone of the forefinger, and, resting between the fore and second finger, was cut out, and all the wounds were cured in less than five weeks, by doctor Thomas Hastings." See Samuel Penhallow, The History of the Wars of New England with the Eastern Indians (Boston, 1726; Facsimile Reprint, Annotated by Edward Wheelock, Williamstown, MA, 1973), Notes, 41.

Berwick nineteen days later.<sup>7</sup> Cotton Mather related the amazing story of Simon Stone who was part of the relief force sent to aid Hilton's garrison in Exeter during the summer of 1690. In the ensuing battle Stone received nine gunshot wounds and two cuts with hatchets and was presumed dead. However, when his comrades came to bury him they found him still alive. According to Mather, an "Irishman" in the company suggested they put Stone out of his misery. Rejecting the Irishman's advice, the provincials gave Stone a drink of "fair water" and then a drink of "strong water." Stone opened his eyes and began his long road to recovery.<sup>8</sup>

Edged weapon cuts resulting in combat, like those received by Stone, usually occurred after a soldier was wounded. Delivered as a *coup de grâce*, the Indians used their hatchets to dispatch the wounded and helpless they could not take as prisoners.<sup>9</sup> The survival rate after this treatment was obviously very low. That Simon Stone recovered from two hatchet blows, in addition to his other wounds, was a tribute to his strength and constitution. According to Jeremy Belknap, a similar incident occurred

---

<sup>7</sup> "Thomas Westbrook to Lt-Governor William Dummer, May 28, 1725," James Phinney Baxter, ed., Documentary History of the State of Maine (Portland, ME, 1907), Collections of the Maine Historical Society, 2nd Series, Vol. X, 283-4.

<sup>8</sup> Mather, Decennium Luctuosum in Lincoln, ed., Narratives of the Indian Wars, 221-2.

<sup>9</sup> Usually referred to as being "knocked in the head," this was the treatment recommended for Simon Stone by that dispassionate Irishman.



during an attack on Dover, New Hampshire on September 15, 1725. Apparently John Evans "received a slight wound in the breast, which bleeding plentifully, deceived them, and thinking him dead, they stripped and scalped him. He bore the painful operation without discovering any signs of life, though all the time in his perfect senses, and continued in the feigned appearance of death, till they had turned him over and struck him several blows with their guns, and left him for dead."<sup>10</sup>

Although small arms and hand held weapons caused the vast majority of battle wounds suffered by provincials, they were exposed to cannon fire at Louisbourg. From the few descriptions provided by journalists, it appears most of the traumas produced by artillery shells and round shot were of a decidedly lethal nature. One anonymous chronicler saw a dead man carried back from the trenches with "his skull crushed by a shell fragment." One gunner had his "head split in two" by a shell fragment. The journalist also reported that one soldier had his "leg shot off by a cannon ball; another shot in the elbow, had to be amputated; another shot in the knee, not expected to live."<sup>11</sup>

Enemy musket fire and artillery shells obviously constituted a hazard to soldiers engaged in military operations, but another source of serious injury and even death

---

<sup>10</sup> Jeremy Belknap, The History of New Hampshire (Reprint of 1831 edition, New York, 1970) Vol 1, 217.

<sup>11</sup> Louis E. De Forest, Louisbourg Journals: 1745 (New York, 1932), 16-18.

were accidents and simple carelessness. During a scout in February, 1723 commanded by Johnson Harmon, a soldier fired his musket at a tree and the bullet "Glancing Straingley" killed another man.<sup>12</sup> On October 25, 1704, a minister in the town of Gardiner volunteered to stand night guard in a garrison as the inhabitants had been out on pursuit all day. According to Samuel Penhallow, the minister "being cold ... was coming down to warm himself; when one between Sleeping and Waking, or surpriz'd thro' excess of Fear, fir'd upon him as he was coming out of the watch tower." The minister staggered to the door of the garrison and collapsed inside. He forgave the man who had shot him and died within an hour.<sup>13</sup> Jeremy Belknap related a similar instance which occurred in Rochester, New Hampshire in 1746 when a man left his post in the town at night and entered the nearby woods, where he was shot by another sentry.<sup>14</sup>

---

<sup>12</sup> "Letter from Johnson Harmon, February 25, 1723," William Blake Trask, Letters of Colonel Thomas Westbrook and others Relative to Indian Affairs in Maine, 1722-1726 (Boston, 1901), 11-12.

<sup>13</sup> Penhallow, History of the Wars of New England. 27-8.

<sup>14</sup> Belknap, History of New Hampshire, 291. In addition, the Rev. John Pike recorded in his journal on September 16, 1707 that a man killed a woman in York under similar circumstances, was tried for her murder and acquitted. See "Journal of the Rev. John Pike," Massachusetts Historical Society Proceedings, 1876, XIV, 146. In replying to Johnson Harmon's report on the death from the ricochet, Lt-Governor William Dummer wrote "I hope the Soldiers will be warned for the Time to come of such Carelessness & Folly, You must give strict Orders that no Guns be fired but at the Enemy, Unless by the Leave and in the Presence of an Officer." See "Dummer to Harmon, March 8, 1723," James Phinney Baxter, ed., Documentary History of the State of Maine (Portland,

Combatants on the northern frontier, on both sides, not only shot each other by accident, but shot themselves as well. This was usually accomplished by carelessly holding the muzzle of their weapons while pulling them. The cock would be caught on something and pulled back, releasing the sear from the tumbler inside the lock, and allowing the cock to fly forward when cleared from the obstruction. Cotton Mather related, with unrestrained satisfaction, that the Irishman who so cold-bloodily suggested that Simon Stone put out of his misery was crippled a few minutes later when he used the cock of his gun to pull a canoe to shore while holding the muzzle. The gun went off and broke his arm.<sup>15</sup> On two other occasions, according to Mather, French Indians were killed in the same manner. One was a "a famous kind of a Giant among the Indians; a Fellow Reputed Seven Foot High ... this famous and bloody Fellow accidentally Shot himself to Death, by his Gun going off, when he was foolishly pulling a Canoe to the Shore with it."<sup>16</sup> In a similar occurrence, a provincial soldier on a scout in 1725 "took hold of his Gun that stood among some Bushes drew it towards him with the

---

ME, 1907), Collections of the Maine Historical Society, 2nd Series, Vol. IX, 474.

<sup>15</sup> Mather, Decennium Luctuosum in Lincoln, ed., Narratives of the Indian Wars, 221-2.

<sup>16</sup> Mather, Decennium Luctuosum in Lincoln, ed., Narratives of the Indian Wars, 271.

muzzle towards him some twigg caught hold of the cock, the Gun went of, and shott him through, he died Imediately."<sup>17</sup>

Freak accidents also took their toll on provincial soldiers. Eleazer Young, Jr. of Dover reported to the government that while on a scout toward Lake Winnepesaukee in 1744 and "firing off my Gun on an Necessary Occasion Providence so ordered that the Gun split all in Pieces By which means your Petitioner Received a very bad wound."<sup>18</sup> Joseph Bane told government authorities that while he was stationed at Fort Mary in Saco, his captain ordered him to fire his gun to set the watch. The gun exploded and "his hand Broke into peeces: his thumb and three fingers shoot off by splitting of [the] Gun."<sup>19</sup> At Louisbourg the exploding of improperly loaded cannons also caused considerable death and injury.<sup>20</sup>

Soldiers also cut themselves with axes and hatchets. John Lovewell recorded that on his second raid in February, 1725, one of his men cut himself badly with an ax, and had

---

<sup>17</sup> "John White to William Dummer, May 9, 1725," Annals of Lancaster, Massachusetts, 1643-1825 (Clinton, MA, 1884), 224-5.

<sup>18</sup> "Petition of Eleazer Young, Jr., Dec 14, 1744," Isaac Hammond, ed., Documents Relating to Towns in New Hampshire. "A" to "F" Inclusive (Concord, 1882) New Hampshire Provincial and State Papers, Vol. XI, 514.

<sup>19</sup> "Petition of Joseph Bane, October 13, 1702," Baxter, ed., Doc. Hist. Me., Vol. IX, 136.

<sup>20</sup> "Pepperrell Papers," Collections of the Massachusetts Historical Society, Series VI, Vol. X (1899), 155, 166-9. See Chapter Five. The force of an exploding cannon barrel is tremendous. One observer at Louisbourg reported that one section of a burst gun "landed on a house and crashed down through it into the cellar." See De Forest, Louisbourg Journals, 18.

to be carried home by six others.<sup>21</sup> During the following fall Simon Willard reported that one of his men had also cut himself with a hatchet and had to be carried home.<sup>22</sup> In 1748 Lieutenant John Burk indicated one of the soldiers at Number Four also had an accident with an ax.<sup>23</sup> Other bizarre incidents injured soldiers as well. Willard reported that another soldier on his scout cut his foot on a rock,<sup>24</sup> and Burk related that while they were building a new privy or "little house" a soldier named Cory "tore his ass" sliding off the roof.<sup>25</sup>

While wounds in battle, accidents and carelessness caused their share of suffering and death, illness and disease accounted for far more. It is a well known fact that in the early modern period, and actually up until the twentieth century, disease killed more soldiers than bullets, and the early French wars in New England proved to

---

<sup>21</sup> "Journal of John Lovewell, January 29 to February 27, 1725," James Phinney Baxter, ed., Documentary History of the State of Maine (Portland, ME, 1916), Collections of the Maine Historical Society, 2nd Series, Vol. XXIII, 151.

<sup>22</sup> "Journal of Samuel Willard, September, 1725," Annals of Lancaster, 231-2.

<sup>23</sup> "Journal of Lieutenant John Burk," Stevens Family Papers, Special Collections, University of Vermont. Entry for May 10, 1748.

<sup>24</sup> "Journal of Samuel Willard, September, 1725," Annals of Lancaster, 231-2.

<sup>25</sup> "Journal of Lieutenant John Burk," Stevens Family Papers, Spec. Colls, U. of Vermont, Entry for March 3, 1748.

be no exception.<sup>26</sup> The various expeditions, with their greater numbers of participants, were particularly deadly in this regard. During the Phips' expedition to Quebec in 1690, small pox helped defeat the two-pronged assault by halting the attack on Montreal while sea sickness and fever laid low a substantial portion of Phips' army before he even arrived. Even more would die on the return voyage from small pox and camp fever.<sup>27</sup> Simon Wainwright reported from Port Royal in 1707 that "There is a considerable number of [soldiers] visited with violent fluxes, and although we have things proper to give them, yet dare not do it; others taken with mighty swellings in their throats; others filled with terror at the consideration of a fatal event of the expedition, concluding that, in a short time, there will not be well enough to carry off the sick."<sup>28</sup>

The deadly consequences of Cartagena and Louisbourg are also well known. Of the 3,600 Americans, from all colonies, enlisted for Cartagena, only 500 returned, the rest victims of disease.<sup>29</sup> The sickness at Louisbourg began to take hold

---

<sup>26</sup> John Keegan and Richard Holmes, Soldiers: A History of Men in Battle (New York, 1985), 143.

<sup>27</sup> Samuel Adams Drake, The Border Wars of New England. Commonly called King William's and Queen Anne's Wars (1897, reprint of 1910 edition, Williamstown, MA, 1973), 64-5.

<sup>28</sup> Thomas Hutchinson, The History of the Colony and Province of Massachusetts Bay (London, 1768; reprint Cambridge, MA, 1936), 126.

<sup>29</sup> Douglas Edward Leach, Arms for Empire: A Military History of the British Colonies in North America, 1607-1763 (New York, 1973), 218.

after the fortress had fallen, and multiplied throughout the fall and winter. At the end of January, 1746, William Pepperrell wrote to Governor William Shirley that they had buried 561 men, and 1,100 were sick and dying at a rate of three, four or five daily. Pepperrell indicated that the daily death rate had been as high as fourteen or fifteen.<sup>30</sup> In the end over 2,000 provincials would die from disease at Louisbourg.<sup>31</sup>

While the illness associated with expeditions is familiar, sickness struck provincial forces posted on the frontier as well. Throughout the early French war period, illnesses swept through the garrisons at forts, crippled scouting forces, and hampered planning and operations. In 1690 James Converse reported to the Bay government from Portsmouth that "our Soldiers are sick some of the small pox and others of A feaver, I have borrowed bread for the Hospetall, and the sick in severall places ... I beseech your Honors to Consider what difficulty I meet with to provide Oatmeal, butter, Candle &c, for the sick with my own

---

<sup>30</sup> "Pepperrell to Shirley, January 28, 1746," "Pepperrell Papers," Colls. Mass. Hist. Soc., Series VI, Vol. X, 442.

<sup>31</sup> Douglas Edward Leach, Roots of Conflict: British Armed Forces and Colonial Americans, 1677-1763 (Chapel Hill, NC, 1986), 74. The death rate at Louisbourg was not all that unusual for an eighteenth century military operation, and even the British army and navy has lost men through disease because of negligence and inattention (see below).

money."<sup>32</sup> His lament would be echoed by other frontier commanders. In 1712 Samuel Moody reported a fever in the garrison at Casco where ten soldiers were in bed, and during King George's War a sickness called "black tongue" swept through the fort at Gorham, Maine. Four died and so many men were stricken, including the eleven soldiers posted there, the women had to stand on watch.<sup>33</sup> Thomas Westbrook, commander on the Maine frontier in Dummer's War, found that so many men had died or had been discharged due to illness that he had trouble forming raiding parties, and those that did go out often were aborted due to sickness.<sup>34</sup>

British military leaders blamed a lack of discipline and cleanliness for the prevalence of illness in colonial

---

<sup>32</sup> "James Convers to Governor and Council, November 3, 1690," Baxter, ed., Doc. Hist. Me., Vol. V, 157.

<sup>33</sup> "Samuel Moody to Governor Joseph Dudley, March 23, 1712," Baxter, ed., Doc. Hist. Me., Vol. IX, 310; Hugh D. McLellan, History of Gorham, Maine (Portland, ME, 1903), 60. Benjamin Church related one amusing incident concerning sickness among frontier soldiers. On the return of his 1690 raiding force to Portsmouth after his raid, rumors spread that Church was being ordered to take them out again. When some of the men feigned symptoms of small pox in order to be excused from further duty, Church arranged for them to be placed in a house where the people already had the disease. They all would stay in the building stay until the disease ran its course, "Whereupon they all presently began to grow better, and to make excuses." Church told officials the best cure was to let them go home. See Thomas Church, The History of the Great Indian War of 1675 and 1676 Commonly called Philip's War, also, The Old French and Indian Wars, from 1689 to 1704 (Hartford, Conn, 1845 edition, orig. pub. 1716), 195.

<sup>34</sup> "Westbrook to Dummer, April 2, 1724," Baxter, ed., Doc. Hist. Me., Vol. X, 186-7.



troops. Commodore Charles Knowles comments on conditions at Louisbourg when he arrived to relieve Peter Warren seem to be explicit regarding the lack of elementary precautions to prevent illness. "The confused, dirty beastly Condition I found this Place in is not to be expressed ... these New England Folks were so lazy, that they not only pulled one End of the House down to burn which they lived in, but even buried their dead under the Floors and did their Filth in the other corners of the House rather than go out of Doors in the Cold."<sup>35</sup> While British officers did impose clean habits on their soldiers, such as the regular changing and cleaning of uniforms, as part of the system of discipline, the provincial experience with disease reflects only the general inadequacies of the age concerning medical knowledge. Certainly the redcoats decimated at Cartagena or the thousands of British seamen struck down by scurvy and other illnesses did not die any differently than provincial soldiers.<sup>36</sup>

---

<sup>35</sup> Quoted in Leach, Roots of Conflict, 74

<sup>36</sup> John Keegan and Richard Holmes reported that 135,000 of the 185,000 sailors recruited by the Royal Navy during the Seven Years' War died of disease. During the Crimean War, 4,285 soldiers died of wounds, 16,422 died of cholera, typhoid, dysentery and exposure. The losses to the British army in the Crimea from typhoid and cholera due to primitive sanitary conditions would be repeated in the Boer War as well. And in the latter case the increased knowledge available on germs and the causes of disease makes the neglect all the more inexcusable. See Keegan and Holmes, Soldiers, 143-4; Thomas Pakenham, The Boer War (New York, 1979), 403.

For soldiers involved in raids and probes, the problems of wounds, accidents and sickness were increased fourfold by being stuck in the middle of the wilderness miles from the nearest settlement. Although such problems existed in all the wars, Dummer's War seemed to be exceptional, or at least provides the best examples of this added complexity. In the fall of 1724 Samuel Wheelwright led a company of fifty men toward Pequawket which turned into a march of misery. On November 25 they marched eight miles and repeated the same the next day. Travel was difficult due to early snow. On the 26th, three men went home sick.

27<sup>th</sup> marched 15 miles, 4 more went back sick. 28<sup>th</sup> sent back 12 more sick: 30<sup>th</sup> Lay still, --fould weather, and men sick; --within 10 miles of 'Osaby Pond.' --Dec. 1. When I came to muster the men in order to march some were sick some Lane and Some Dead tired Could not get above 18 or 20 that was fitt to march forward upon which I called the officers together for Advice and soe Concluded to Return again which was Contrary to my Enclination.<sup>37</sup>

The following summer a scout of men led by Seth Wyman and John White encountered similar results. After they staggered into Dover, Richard Waldron described the scout to Lt-Governor John Wentworth as told to him by the captains.

---

<sup>37</sup> "Journal of Samuel Wheelwright, November to December, 1724," Baxter, ed., Doc. Hist. Me., Vol. XXIII, 151.

last night came in here Capts Wyman and White and say that before they got to Penny Cook their men began to be taken sick, with a bloody flux, soe that they were forc'd to Send Sundry back before they got to Penny Cook and that the distemper Increased daily till they had not men enough to carry their own and Sick mens packs, and at last hardly 20 men in a company were the Successive rains were very hurtfull and very much retarded their march by raising the brooks and rivers, and by that time they got to the upper end of Winnipicisauky pond they found their further March as was designed Impracticable so were forced to return bringing in one of their Sick men upon their Shoulders.<sup>38</sup>

Both Seth Wyman and John White were among the sick, and both men would die soon after their return.<sup>39</sup>

Lovewell's last raid provides perhaps the most poignant examples of the difficulties associated with wounds and sickness in the wilderness. Almost immediately after

---

<sup>38</sup> "Richard Waldron to John Wentworth, July 31, 1725," Baxter, ed., Doc. Hist. Me., Vol. X, 317. For more details on this scout, see Chapter Four. The journal of the scout is printed in the Annals of Lancaster, 232-4.

<sup>39</sup> Both men had been very active in the provincial service. Wyman had led numerous raids in Queen Anne's War (including the infamous scout to Monadnock Mountain which resulted in a panic among his men) and Dummer's War, and was the hero of Lovewell's fight. White also served on many raids and was with Lovewell during his second raid when they killed the ten Indians. His widow's petition describing her husband's service is printed in the Annals of Lancaster, 227.

leaving Dunstable, three men turned back when an old wound disabled one of the soldiers. By the time the company reached Ossipee Pond, another soldier, Benjamin Kidder, fell ill. Lovewell and his men constructed a crude fort and left Kidder in the care of their doctor, William Ayer, along with eight men to guard them. Lovewell then pushed on to his fateful battle.

After the fight the shattered company pulled itself together and began their retreat to the crude fort. Four of the wounded, Lieutenant Josiah Farwell, the young chaplain Jonathan Frye, Josiah Jones and Eleazer Davis, seemed to be too hurt to travel, and were left behind with the promise that help would be sent. The remainder, many of whom were also wounded, split into three parties and made their way home. When they arrived at their fort, they found it abandoned with a note left saying all of Lovewell's company had been killed.<sup>40</sup> Some food had been left and while they refreshed themselves, another wounded man, Solomon Keyes, arrived. Keyes had been wounded three times and had crawled away during the fight after calling out that he was a dead man. However, Keyes found a canoe, crawled into it, and floated to safety.

Meanwhile, the other four men, realizing that help would be a long time coming, struggled on as best they could. After his return and partial recovery, Eleazer Davis

---

<sup>40</sup> Benjamin Hassell had run to the fort and the extent of his panic is evident in the note that was left.

described his adventure to Samuel Penhallow. "The report he gave me was," wrote Penhallow,

... that Lieut. Farewell, with Mr. Fry their Chaplain, Josiah Jones, and himself, who were all wounded, march'd towards the Fort; but Jones steer'd another way, and after a long fategue and hardship got safe into Saco. Mr. Frye three days after, thro' the extremity of his Wounds, began to faint and languish, and died. ... Mr. Farewell held out in his return till the eleventh day; during which time he had nothing to eat but Water and a few Roots which he chewed; and by this time the Wounds thro' his Body were so mortified, that the Worms made a thorow Passage. The same day this Davis caught a Fish which he broil'd, and was greatly refresh'd there with; but the Lieut. was so much spent, that he could not taste a bit. Davis being now alone in a melancholy desolate state, still made toward the Fort, and the next day came to it, where he found some Pork and Bread, by which he was enabled to return as before mentioned.<sup>41</sup>

The possibility of wounds, accidents and sickness, especially far removed from home or settlements, made medi-

---

<sup>41</sup> Penhallow, History of the Wars of New England, 114-5; Francis Parkman, A Half-Century of Conflict (Boston, 1892), 250-57; George Hill Evans, Pigwacket (Somerville, MA, 1939), 62-69. Davis came into Berwick nineteen days after the fight, see above.

cal care and doctors of prime importance to provincial soldiers. Doctors participated in all expeditions, they served on the frontier and even accompanied all but the smallest of scouting parties. In fact, some raids were delayed because the soldiers refused to go out without a doctor. Whether pressed for service or volunteers, New England doctors tended the sick, patched up the wounded and provided care for long term recovery. In many instances they also caught the illnesses of their patients and died themselves. In this respect Louisbourg proved particularly deadly to provincial physicians.

At the beginning of King William's War, there were very few surgeons on the northern frontier. Field commanders consistently applied to the Bay government to provide surgeons for the Eastern frontier. Jeremiah Swain wrote in October, 1689 that his command was "under great disadvantage by reason of the sickness of many the want of a chyrurgeon," and that November, Captain Simon Willard, commander of Massachusetts forces in Maine, indicated that he "should be glad if Doctor Hardin [Arden] had some Encouragement and that your Honors would send him to Casco: We may loose men of sicknes or wounds without a Doctor."<sup>42</sup>

---

<sup>42</sup> "Letter from Jeremiah Swaine at Salmon Falls, October 15, 1689," Baxter, ed., Doc. Hist. Me., Vol. IX, 65-66; "Capt. Simon Willard to Governor and Council, November 29, 1689," Baxter, ed., Doc. Hist. Me., Vol. V, 14. Dr. William Arden, according to his petition, "being Employed in their Majestyes Service as Chirurgeon to the last forces Sent to Falmouth under Command of Major Benjamin Church, as allso being Ordered to Attend the fort ... to perform the said Duty or function (many

The situation had not improved by the summer of 1691 when John March and Daniel King began their raid along the Maine coast. This trouble-plagued scouting party found themselves further hampered by a lack of a doctor willing to accompany them. In the march from Haverhill to Exeter they lost fourteen men through lameness or illness, and by the time they reached Portsmouth half their men were unfit for anything but garrison duty. March and King requested reinforcements and permission to press men locally to fill their companies, as well as a surgeon. "Wee cannot gett a Doctor here So that wee can prossecute not anything to the purpose with out one."<sup>43</sup> Local leaders William Vaughn and Charles Frost amplified the problem for Massachusetts authorities. "A Surgeon must be also Sent ... for wee have but 3 in these parts and two of them are wholly incapable of travail and the 3d has the York wounded men under his care they all say they have already done more for the Country Service, than all the Surgeons in the Country Soe that none can be had here."<sup>44</sup> The government pointed out to Vaughn and Frost that as "a Chyrurgion cannot be timely fitted out hence for that Service, its of necessity that one of yours do attend

---

persons being then there Sick) ever Since the 23rd of Aprill last, and hath Remained their to Attend their Majesties service as Surgeon." See "Petition of William Arden," Baxter, ed., Doc. Hist. Me., Vol. V, 55.

<sup>43</sup> "King and March to Bay Government, July 12, 1691," Baxter, ed., Doc. Hist. Me., Vol. V, 264-5.

<sup>44</sup> "William Vaughn and Charles Frost to Governor and Council, July 11, 1691," Baxter, ed., Doc. Hist. Me., Vol. V, 265-6.

it." They had assumed one of the local doctors would accompany March and King, "otherwise we should have done .. but shall hold our Selves concerned to see him paid as if he had been sent from hence."<sup>45</sup>

On July 17, March reported the failure to secure a surgeon, despite the efforts of William Vaughn and Charles Frost and their "perswasive Arguments and profittable promisses." Vaughn "offered that if any one of them would goe he (with the rest of the Gentlemen) would collect or contribute a considerable Sum of mony to Satisfaction," but the doctors were not moved. They had worked in the country's service and "have not been paid any thing for all their disburstments." March and King warned that their plans were "frustrated, for our men will not goe with out a Chirurgion."<sup>46</sup> Vaughn and Frost confirmed their failure in this respect. They had no difficulty finding volunteers soldiers, as the raid fell "between hilling their Corne, and their Hay and English harvest, we found them Soe Spirited to it that noe thinge would have Diverted the Design, But ... the want of A Surgeon (with out which men would not goe) and none to be Obtained here, on Any termes."<sup>47</sup>

---

<sup>45</sup> "Governor and Council to Vaughn and Frost, July 13, 1691," Baxter, ed., Doc. Hist. Me., Vol. V, 268.

<sup>46</sup> "King and March to Governor and Council, July 17, 1691," Baxter, ed., Doc. Hist. Me., Vol. V, 268-9.

<sup>47</sup> "Vaughn and Frost to Governor and Council, July 17, 1691," Baxter, ed., Doc. Hist. Me., Vol. V, 270.



The Bay government was "very unhappy" that this raid could be ruined by the refusal of the local doctors. "It seems strange and very absurd that notwithstanding the proposals and Encouragements offered they should decline their Majesties Service." The government could also not understand why March and King had not simply "constrained one of them to have gone upon this Emergency." In the end they were forced to send a doctor with the reinforcements.<sup>48</sup> However, the Massachusetts authorities seemed to have been correct about being unable to "fitt out" a surgeon in a hurry, because March and King later reported after their encounter with the Indians on the beach that "our doctor [was] Not provided with things convenient for our wounded men."<sup>49</sup> The shortages of doctors would continue to be a problem on the frontier. In 1695 Charles Frost indicated that the "souldiers are discoridg for want of a Curirgent there is non in our Country if we should have wounded men as we may Expect I know not what to doe with them."<sup>50</sup>

As a precious commodity, surgeons were carefully protected from harm. Before attacking an Indian village during his 1690 raid, Benjamin Church ordered his "captains to draw out of their several companies sixty of their

---

<sup>48</sup> "Governor and Council to March and King, July 20, 1691," Baxter, ed., Doc. Hist. Me., Vol. V, 270-1.

<sup>49</sup> "March and King to Governor and Council, August 7, 1691," Baxter, ed., Doc. Hist. Me., Vol. V, 282-3.

<sup>50</sup> "Charles Frost to Lt-Governor Stoughton, September 21, 1695," Baxter, ed., Doc. Hist. Me., Vol. V, 431-2.

meanest men, to be a guard to the Doctor and knapsacks."<sup>51</sup> John Lovewell built his crude fort and left behind eight soldiers to protect the doctor and the sick Benjamin Kidder. But provincial officers could not protect their doctors from the diseases they fought, and often the shortage of surgeons was aggravated by their succumbing to illness and exhaustion. With all the sickness on the Maine frontier during Dummer's War, Colonel Thomas Westbrook had difficulty finding enough doctors and keeping them alive. Westbrook's original instructions when he became commander of Massachusetts forces in the fall of 1723 had been explicit concerning surgeons. "You are allowed three Surgeons only for the Forces, one to be posted at Brunswick Fort, an other at Falmouth, and the other to be posted at York, but either of them may be ordered to march with the companies when you shall thought necessary. The said Surgeons will be allowed Five Pounds per Month, each."<sup>52</sup> But by the following spring the situation had become desperate. Sickness gripped most of the provincial forts, and the care of wounded became difficult at best. Repeatedly Westbrook asked the government for more doctors. On March 23 a Sergeant Samuel Smith was shot from ambush near Arundel. Six days later Westbrook reported that

---

<sup>51</sup> Church, The History of the Great Indian War, 184.

<sup>52</sup> "Lt-Governor William Dummer to Westbrook, October 1, 1723," Trask, Letters of Colonel Thomas Westbrook, 38-9.

They ... have taken a great deal of pains to get a doctor for the wounded man, they went to Portsmouth and brought one as far as York, and there he was taken sick; so they returned and went as far as Greenland but could get none from thence, they came to Falmouth for Doctor Negus, who was taken sick the 27th Instant and died the 29th between eight and nine in the morning. We have had an Instance of the like sudden death in the past week, a stout man about twenty five years of age was taken sick and died in about forty hours - we stand in Absolute necessity of two doctors to visit the sundry sick among us and likewise to dress the wounded man Doctor Bulman having his hands full at Richmond and Arrowsick. I doubt not but your Honor will take speedy care to send them.<sup>53</sup>

On April 1, Westbrook wrote that he hoped Doctor Bulman might be spared to visit the sick at Falmouth, but several men were very ill at Arrowsick, and two had died.<sup>54</sup> The next day he wrote that offensive operations were questionable due to widespread illness, and added in a postscript

---

<sup>53</sup> "Westbrook to Dummer, March 29, 1724," Baxter, ed., Doc. Hist. Me., Vol. X, 183-4.

<sup>54</sup> "Westbrook to Dummer, April 1, 1724," Baxter, ed., Doc. Hist. Me., Vol. X, 184-5.

that "the wounded man died the 1st Instant. I am afraid for want of a doctor."<sup>55</sup>

The Doctor Bulman mentioned by Westbrook refers to Dr. Alexander Bulman of York, Maine, a man who comes closest to being a true military doctor. Bulman was born in 1702, the son of a Boston baker.<sup>56</sup> He came to Maine as surgeon to the provincial forces under Westbrook in 1722, and obviously from Westbrook's descriptions, performed above and beyond the call of duty in administering the sick at Fort Richmond and Arrowsick. In fact, during the spring and summer of 1724, Bulman was by all indications the only doctor available on the frontier. Westbrook advised Lt-Governor Dummer in August that Bulman was the only doctor available to accompany the raiding force, and "he being very much fatigued I must entreat your Honour to send another Doctor down to march that he may have some respite."<sup>57</sup>

Bulman apparently impressed the inhabitants enough for the town of York to vote £100 to have him settle in the town for the rest of his life. Bulman purchased a home near the meeting house in the center of town, and continued his practice in York.<sup>58</sup> He and his wife, Mary, became close friends of William and Mary Pepperrell of Kittery. When the

---

<sup>55</sup> "Westbrook to Dummer, April 2, 1724," Baxter, ed., Doc. Hist. Me., Vol. X, 186-7.

<sup>56</sup> Banks, History of York, Maine, Vol. II, 397.

<sup>57</sup> "Westbrook to Dummer, August, 1724," Baxter, ed., Doc. Hist. Me., Vol. X, 216.

<sup>58</sup> Banks, History of York, Maine, Vol. II, 324

Louisbourg expedition was proposed in early 1745, Bulman showed keen interest and support, but tied his own participation to the actions of his friend, William Pepperrell. On February 4, Bulman wrote to Pepperrell to inform him of the response to recruiting efforts in York. As for his own participation, Bulman wrote that "I have some reason to conclude from what I have heard that your Honor has declined, so that I look upon my [self] free from any special obligation to attend the present service."<sup>59</sup> However, Pepperrell did accept the commission as overall commander, and Alexander Bulman was named as surgeon to Pepperrell's regiment and as personal surgeon to the commander-in-chief.

After the fall of the fortress, Bulman apparently wrote his wife, like so many others on that expedition, that he would soon be coming home. Mary Bulman replied that she was "Glad to hear of your Speedy return home and allso of your health I pray God continue and confirm it to you and give ... occasion to rejoice in his goodness while apart."<sup>60</sup> But

---

<sup>59</sup> Banks, History of York, Maine, Vol. I, 333-4.

<sup>60</sup> "Mary Bulman to Husband, July 9, 1745," Me. Hist. Soc. Manuscripts, Vol. I, 20. Mary also wrote "am now tired and must break Silence and talk to you tho at so great a Distance. perhaps you are presently regaling yourself in the Governors Apartment surroned with the most agreeable Company while Im set Solatary and have nothing to Convers with but the Domesticks of my own family which at present is none but the cat -- My walks in my Gardin with assorted fruits and flowers but what are these to me while the dear Partner of my life and all my joy is absent. These are all Dull in Sipped things which yield me no Delight therefore must hast away to my relief." She hoped he had received her

Bulman was not to return. As the weeks went by his time and talents were increasingly in demand to tend the growing number of sick. Finally, in early September, Bulman himself became ill. On September 5, the Rev. Stephen Williams "found him in a sweet frame of mind," but on his return the next day, the minister found Bulman "very low."<sup>61</sup> On the 11th, Pepperrell wrote to his wife, saying,

... And now my dear, I must tell you something of the distress and anguish of my soul. My prudent and valiant Doctor Bulman, although has had his health finely until about six days past, was taken with a nervous fever and given over. I expected the day past he would not have lived, but blessed be God there is some hopes this morning. The lord in great mercy continue him to us if it is his holy and blessed will.<sup>62</sup>

Pepperrell's prayer would not be answered. On the same day that he wrote those lines, September 11, Alexander Bulman died.<sup>63</sup>

---

letters sent "under the care of Mrs. Pepperrell in Kittery with a box which contained 2 old holland shirts, a pare of stockings, and some gingerbread which I suppose is spoiled by this time."

<sup>61</sup> De Forest, Louisbourg Journals, 140, 141.

<sup>62</sup> Henry S. Burrage, Maine at Louisbourg in 1745 (Augusta, ME, 1910), 99-100.

<sup>63</sup> Louisbourg was especially hard on doctors. William Pepperrell reported to Governor William Shirley in January, 1746 that two doctors had been lost when a

The treatment that doctors like Bulman and the others gave their patients, or themselves received, was obviously primitive and rudimentary compared to modern medical practices. The documentation on actual treatment is sparse, and can only hint at the medicines and remedies employed, but they do paint a small picture of military medical methods. One soldier at Louisbourg, George Mygate from Springfield, Massachusetts, left an account of his illness and treatment. As a member of the force who arrived after the fortress had fallen, he spent part of the summer picking berries and hunting, but eventually began to feel ill. Mygate recorded that he "had not been well for a while, went to bed woke up in the middle of the night with a fever and a pain in the chest." His illness worsened and he was taken to the hospital and given "ipecec and salt vitriol." Mygate seemed to improve for a while, then suffered a relapse. The doctors advised several cures, he was "bled to be cured of a cough, which caused him to vomit; next day took a physic." His journal entries were taken over by Caleb Lamb at that

---

ship sank. See "Pepperrell Papers," Colls. Mass. Hist. Soc., Series VI, Vol. X, 442. John Ladd petitioned the New Hampshire Assembly in 1746 concerning "his Son Jonathan Lad [who] went to Louisbourg in his Majesties Service in the Capacity of a Physitian and in his Return was taken Sick of the Distemper that Reign'd at Louisbourg, and was landed in a verry weak and low condition." Ladd reported that his son died not long after his return. See "Petition of John Ladd relative to his Son, August 2, 1746," Isaac Hammond, ed., Miscellaneous Provincial and State Papers (Manchester, NH, 1890) New Hampshire Provincial and State Papers, Vol. XVIII, 284.

point, and eventually Lamb would record the death of his friend George Mygate.<sup>64</sup>

Of course wounds, illness and the remedies had to endured or administered without any means of easing the pain. Because of the advance of medical science, and the development of pain reducing drugs and anesthesia, twentieth century men and women shrink from the thoughts of unnecessary suffering, and marvel at the strength, and bad fortune perhaps, of those in the past who experienced such pain. People in the past did not feel any less pain than we do, nor were they stronger or more stoic in their view of pain. The only difference is that we often have the choice of feeling pain or not, they knew no alternative. It is the choice which makes our acceptance so difficult. At Louisbourg, according to historian Fairfax Downey, "the wounded lay ranged in double rows on piles of loose straw. Some moaned steadily, others, to stifle their agony, chewed leather straps or blocks of soft pine."<sup>65</sup> At Number Four, Lieutenant John Burk recorded how the soldier named Cory who "tore his ass sliding off the House" had his wound dressed the next day. "O'h he grieved," observed Burk. The

---

<sup>64</sup> De Forest, Louisbourg Journals, 98-107.

<sup>65</sup> Fairfax Downey, Louisbourg: Key to a Continent (Englewood Cliffs, NJ, 1965), 96.



following day was much the same. "Corys ass drest," wrote Burk, "O how he squirms."<sup>66</sup>

For many soldiers, especially those with serious wounds, the agony of pain and treatment could continue for years. Peter Legrove spent three months under a doctor's care, "Enduring the Pains that were necessary in order to his Cure," for his leg wound (see above).<sup>67</sup> Thomas Footman, wounded in the fight at Wheelwright Pond in 1690, was under a doctor's care for over seven months, during which time he was "not able to put on his Cloathes."<sup>68</sup> Jonathan Stanhope had "Very often Served his Majesty in the Wars Against the French and Indian Enemy," but on June 19, 1746, near Number Four, he "Received a very grievous Wound in his Arm, ... Your poor petitioner has Suffered Extreme pain, and after the best Means to Obtain healing, Still remains under much pain, and is rendered utterly incapable to labour." Stanhope wrote this petition four years after his wounding.<sup>69</sup>

These few stories represent only a fraction of the incidents involving long term care of wounded soldiers. All of them involved a financial burden far beyond the capabil-

---

<sup>66</sup> "Journal of Lieutenant John Burk," Stevens Family Papers, Spec. Colls., U. of Vermont, Entry for March 4 and 5. Burk actually spelled it "grivd".

<sup>67</sup> "Peter Legroove's Petition, 1699," Baxter, ed., Doc. Hist. Me., Vol. V, 527-8.

<sup>68</sup> "Petition of Thomas Footman, March 29, 1692," Baxter, ed., Doc. Hist. Me., Vol. V, 381-2.

<sup>69</sup> "Petition of Jonathan Stanhope, relative to Indians, 1750," Hammond, ed., NHSP, Vol. XVIII, 379-80.

ities of the individual soldiers, including doctor's bills, support of the soldier and his family during convalescence, not to mention continued maintenance of those crippled and unemployable. Recognizing the need to recompense soldiers wounded in battle, if for no other reason then to aid recruiting, the governments of Northern New England passed laws mandating this support. As early as 1635, Plymouth provided that any soldier who should "returne maymed and hurt he shall be mayntayned competently by the colony duringe his life."<sup>70</sup> Massachusetts and New Hampshire added similar provisions assisting "maimed or otherwise disabled" soldiers to all their levying acts.<sup>71</sup>

At the start of each conflict the provincial legislatures established *ad hoc* committees to hear petitions and recommend appropriate compensation if any.<sup>72</sup> To prevent fraud, petitions generally had to be presented in person, and applicants frequently had to provide corroborating depositions from former commanders, fellow soldiers or doctors. Petitions included such information as military service performed, the circumstances and extent of injuries, and an accounting of expenses incurred. Soldiers sought a

---

<sup>70</sup> Plymouth Colony Laws, 1636, Background of Selective Service (Washington, 1947), Vol II, 12.

<sup>71</sup> "An Act for the Payment of Cure of Souldiers that are Wounded, July 23, 1696," New Hampshire Provincial Laws, Background of Selective Service, 58: "Levying Act, 1693," "Levying Act, 1744," Massachusetts Militia laws, Background of Selective Service, 146, 174.

<sup>72</sup> For an example, see Baxter, ed., Doc. Hist. Me., Vol. V, 177.

payment to cover the cost of medical treatment, and personal compensation for the suffering and loss of work. The latter could be in the form of a cash payment, land grant or an annual pension.<sup>73</sup>

The cost of medical care could be quite extensive when treatment became prolonged. Thomas Footman, wounded in the fight at Wheelwright Pond in 1690, wrote to the Bay government in March, 1692, that his wounds had not healed, and he could not "Exspect to be ever Able to work to get a Competent Living, your petitioner being Reduced to so weake and Low Estate nothing to help himself for present nor for futuer no wages Reseved, nor non to pitte a pore wounded soulder, Charritye also grone Cold the doctors they demand mony."<sup>74</sup> In 1747 Samuel Drown petitioned the New Hampshire Assembly for "Some provision for me to prevent my Soffering and for my comfortable support", and his female relations petitioned the government "for Nursing of Samuel Drown" during his three month convalescence, expecting "the Common wags that Is allowed for nurssing."<sup>75</sup>

---

<sup>73</sup> Provincial governments were flooded with petitions seeking compensation for almost everything imaginable, from both soldiers and inhabitants. References have been made throughout this study to other grievances, however, this discussion will concentrate on wounded soldiers and death compensation to relatives.

<sup>74</sup> "Petition of Thomas Footman, March 29, 1692," Baxter, ed., Doc. Hist. Me., Vol. V, 381.

<sup>75</sup> Petition of Samuel Drown, Wounded Soldier, May 28, 1747; "Bill for Nursing Samuel Drown," Hammond, ed., NHSP, Vol. XVIII, 307-8.

The saga of John Baker illustrates the difficulties associated with the petition process. According to his petitions, Baker was born at Cambridge and brought up in Woburn. He was pressed into service during King Philip's War and wounded in the Swamp Fight at Narragansett when a musket ball broke his arm and passed through his body below the shoulder. Sent to Rhode Island to be cured, he recovered and learned the weaver's trade, worked hard, saved his money, bought some land and built a house in Woburn. However, every so often his wounded arm would "break out." Baker sold his holdings in Woburn and moved to Swansey where he was again pressed for service during King William's War and sent to the Maine Frontier.

According to Baker, the severe cold of the northern climate caused his wounded arm to swell up, and "It broak out with many holes through my arme."<sup>76</sup> By 1700, Baker had been under the care of several doctor's for years, and between the doctor's bills and his inability to work, he was "never like to be my own man, and I have spent all I have in the world, my father dead, my mother a poore widow, I have nothing to help my selfe."<sup>77</sup>

---

<sup>76</sup> In March, 1700, one doctor wrote that Baker's arm was "Hollow from the shoulder to the Elboe the Boane fowl the arm had five holes in it above and under his Armpit Always Runing now it is Almost fild up with flesh and there are now but three holes in it." - "Certificate of Edward Pratt, March 7, 1700;" Baxter, ed., Doc. Hist. Me., Vol. V, 525-6.

<sup>77</sup> "John Baker's Petition, 1700," Baxter, ed., Doc. Hist. Me., Vol. IX, 100-1.

Baker submitted a petition to the Bay government, but when he came to Boston to present it in person, "his Lordship was so bad with the gout that I could not Come to spake with him: which Journey was greatly to my Damage in respect of my wound."<sup>78</sup> A later attempt to present his petition got nowhere because he could not appear in person. The government also apparently insisted he get depositions, "sworn by a magerstreat", from other soldiers who participated in the Swamp Fight to prove he was wounded in the provincial service. He appealed to James Converse to intervene on his behalf, and Converse wrote to the government that Baker was a "poore Wounded soldier" who had spent all he had and was now not "worth A Groat." Converse pointed out that Baker had sent in a petition the previous year but because his wound had prevented him from coming to court nothing had been done.<sup>79</sup>

As he was "lyable to be thrown into Gaol by the doctors," Baker wanted the doctors' bills paid and, "being disabled to work at my trade, and ... a great famaly to maintaine," he requested a yearly pension. In case the Assembly balked at the pension, Baker pointed out that "many skilfull do think this wound will be my death at last, -- and what I pray for is not like to continue long." Baker

---

<sup>78</sup> "Letter John Baker to James Converse, March 6, 1700," Baxter, ed., Doc. Hist. Me., Vol. V, 524-5.

<sup>79</sup> Petition by James Converse in behalf of John Baker, 1700," Baxter, ed., Doc. Hist. Me., Vol. IX, 99. For more on Converse and Baker see Chapter Eight.

was allowed £10 to pay his bills and an annual pension of £4.<sup>80</sup>

A pension or some kind of continued support was the goal of many wounded soldiers. The amounts involved, generally £3 to £5 a year, could not provide full support, especially if the soldier had a family, but it kept them from starving until they recovered and augmented any later wages. For example, Charles Makarty lost his hand early in King William's War, and spent ten weeks under the care of a doctor. He requested a payment for the doctor's bills, "such Annual pay for the future as is generally allowed by the King to maimed and disabled soldiers," and a license to "keepe a house of publick Entertainment."<sup>81</sup> John Ellenwood, one of the soldiers wounded in John March's fight in 1697 (see above), also requested "some small yearly Stipend."<sup>82</sup> Some soldiers were willing to be posted in garrisons or provincial forts in return for continued government support. In September, 1695, Abraham Cook was part of a party of soldiers gathering wood for Fort William Henry at Pemaquid that was ambushed by an enemy war party. Cook "received a Shott in his left arme, which by reason thereof was Cutt off from his body." Despite the loss of his arm, Cook served at

---

<sup>80</sup> "John Baker's Petition, 1700," Baxter, ed., Doc. Hist. Me., Vol. IX, 100-1.

<sup>81</sup> "Petition of Charles Makarty," Baxter, ed., Doc. Hist. Me., Vol. V, 366-7. It is unclear if Makarty received his compensation.

<sup>82</sup> "John Ellenwood's Petition, February, 1701," Baxter, ed., Doc. Hist. Me., Vol. V, 522-3.

the Castle in Boston harbor after his recovery.<sup>83</sup> In 1748, Ebenezer Eastman petitioned the government of New Hampshire to let Joseph Pudney, "a soldier formerly wounded in the service," be "posted at some garrison in Pennecook."<sup>84</sup>

On the whole, the governments of Massachusetts and New Hampshire phased out the granting of pensions and substituted cash payments for wounded soldiers. The early Plymouth law had only mentioned pensions as compensation, but the levying act of 1693 said only that pensions formerly granted would be continued, and that wounded soldiers in the future would be compensated "as this great and general court shall order." Massachusetts would continue to grant pensions in special cases through Queen Anne's War at least, but by 1744 the levying act contained no reference to pensions, stipulating that relief was at the discretion of the government.<sup>85</sup> The elimination of pensions was obviously

---

<sup>83</sup> Cook eventually petitioned the government that because of his wound, he was "wholely rendred incapable of performing any the souldiers worke .. as also of doeing anything whereby to procure a livelyhood for his Subsistence." The Assembly granted him an annual pension of £5.

<sup>84</sup> "Journal of the Assembly, May 27, 1748," Nathaniel Bouton, ed., Documents and Records Relating to the Province of New Hampshire from 1738-1749 (Nashua, NH, 1871), New Hampshire Provincial and State Papers, Vol. V, 910.

<sup>85</sup> "Levying Act, 1693," "Levying Act, 1744," Massachusetts Militia laws, Background of Selective Service, 146, 174.

a cost saving move, and an attempt to simplify provincial book keeping and finances.<sup>86</sup>

Instead of the requested pension, soldiers were given a lump payment "and have no future allowance." For the loss of his hand when his gun exploded (see above), Joseph Bane received £4 10s.<sup>87</sup> Eleazer Rogers was paid £20 for the loss of his eye.<sup>88</sup> Gradually specific values seemed to be attached to specific types of wounds. The loss or incapacitation of an arm netted the petitioner £20, while a leg wound produced £30 to £40.<sup>89</sup> Other injuries were evaluated on a case by case basis. For example, Joshua Jackson, a blacksmith from Portsmouth, New Hampshire, "receivd a blow on the Small of his Back from a Cannon shot while in the

---

<sup>86</sup> A soldier in his early twenties given a annual pension of £5 could realize £150 to £200 if he lived another thirty to forty years. Therefore a single payment of £20 to £30 saved the government a considerable amount of money.

<sup>87</sup> "Petition of Joseph Bane, October 13, 1702," Baxter, ed., Doc. Hist. Me., Vol. IX, 136.

<sup>88</sup> Baxter, ed., Doc. Hist. Me., Vol. 512

<sup>89</sup> For example, William Prescott fell ill at Louisbourg and the "Humor fell into his Leggs and feet in Severe fevors Sores." Prescott eventually lost his right leg and two toes on his left foot, and he requested a pension. The New Hampshire Assembly paid him £30 "for loss of his leg &c." ("William Prescott's Petition," Hammond, ed., NHSP, Vol. XVIII, 282) Benjamin Thomas was granted £20 for an arm wound received at Louisbourg. ("Petition of Benjamin Thomas, 1746," Hammond, ed., NHSP, Vol. XVIII, 261-2). Michael Whidden was hit in the right knee at Louisbourg, and could not continue in his trade as joiner. He was paid £40.



Trenches" and could not continue his trade. Jackson was paid £30 for his troubles.<sup>90</sup>

Provincial governments also paid cash settlement to the nearest relatives of the dead. Amounting to considerably less than the compensation paid to the wounded, survivor benefits were really no more than a token acknowledgement of service provided and loss incurred. As death from disease and battle far outnumbered wounded and maimed, the governments of New Hampshire and Massachusetts could never hope to compensate widows and parents on the same level, there were simply too many of them. In Urban Crucible, Gary Nash has shown that the losses suffered at Cartagena and Louisbourg struck Massachusetts families hard. In Boston alone a census taken the year after the Cartagena campaign revealed 1,200 widows, of which a thousand were in "low circumstances." Louisbourg would later add hundreds to that figure. The attack on the Island battery alone, in which over a hundred men lost their lives, probably left dozens of women and hundreds of children without husbands and fathers.

Therefore, death compensation was meager at best. Enlistment proclamations for Louisbourg promised that "widows or nearest relatives of any officer or soldier that is slain or shall otherwise loose his life in the service, shall be entitled to four months pay."<sup>91</sup> As the monthly pay

---

<sup>90</sup> "Louisbourg Soldier's Petition, Portsmouth Men," Hammond, ed., NHSP, Vol. XVIII, 263.

<sup>91</sup> George Gilmore, Roll of New Hampshire Men at Louisbourg, Cape Breton, 1745 (Concord, NH, 1896), 11.

for private soldiers was 25 shillings, this amounted to a compensation of £5 for relatives of private soldiers. If any more was desired, they would have to petition the government. One list of petitioners compensated by the New Hampshire Assembly after Louisbourg reveals that widows were paid anywhere from £2 to £7, and a review of other petition indicates that £3 was the most common sum allotted to wives of slain soldiers.<sup>92</sup>

But beyond these figures and statistics were families who had their emotional loss compounded by sudden economic hardship. Tabitha Cass of Kensington, New Hampshire, "Widow and Relict of Jonathan Cass", wrote that the "Hardships and Difficulties" her husband experienced at Louisbourg "so Destroyed his Health that when he Returned the Last of August past he was obliged to be Carryed from the Vessell to his House being unable to walk himself and so Remained Sick and under the Doctors hands till the 13th of September when he Died." Tabitha indicated the doctor's bills and other "Necessarys for him" had amounted to a great deal, so "That Your Petitioner is in Low Circumstances and has a Large Family of Children to maintain." The New Hampshire Assembly paid her doctor bills and gave her £5 in compensation.<sup>93</sup>

---

<sup>92</sup> Hammond, ed., NHSP, Vol. XVIII, 286-8. This volume of the New Hampshire Provincial and State Papers is filled with petitions from soldiers and surviving families.

<sup>93</sup> "Petition of Tabitha Cass, Widow of a Louisbourg Soldier, 1746," Hammond, ed., NHSP, Vol. XVIII, 270.

Even harder hit was Sarah Trefethen of New Castle. Her husband volunteered for Louisbourg, and soon after his return "he was taken sick, of which sickness he died in about ten days. That he left your Petitioner with a number of Small Children, That after the death of your Petitioners husband, the whole Family, one excepted, was taken Sick whereby your Petitioner was put to great Straits and difficultys, that she has not wherewith to pay the Funeral charges and Doctors Bills." The Assembly paid her funeral and doctor bills and awarded Sarah £3.<sup>94</sup>

The pain of loss is graphically depicted in the petition of Hugh Montgomery. Hugh was a joiner, "advanced in years and almost past his Labour", who had a "son brought up to his Trade and was Master of it, who went in the Late Expedition against Louisbourg Who was Killed in the attempt upon the Island Battery where he lost his Arms and all that he had with him, and afterwards all that he had in his Tent was taken away by unknown hands." Hugh's son had been using a provincial musket, so when Hugh received the four months' pay as compensation, the cost of the musket was deducted from it. "That the Death of his said Son is a very heavy and Grievous loss to your Petitioner," wrote the old man,

not only with Respect to his Relation to him and the strong ties of Natural Affection (which in this Case were Increased by a Constant dutiful behavior) but in

---

<sup>94</sup> "Petition of Sarah Trefethen, February 18, 1746," Hammond, ed., NHSP, Vol. XVIII, 263-4.

Special, with Regard to the profit of his Labour in the Prime time of his Service, being about Nineteen Years of Age when he listed and Particular Circumstances of your Petitioner, his said Son being his Chief Support the staff of his Age, and the main Stay of his Family, by the Remarkable Diligence and application of the Youth in his Business, and his thorough Mastery of it.

That Your Petitioner humbly Conceives it not only agreeable to Natural Justice to make such as hazarded their lives for the Service of their Country in so Eminent and Extraordinary a manner, or the Relations of those who died in the Service, a Generous Reward proportioned to the Hazzrds and Benefits of the Event, but also Agreeable to the Practice of all other Places in this and like Cases, Especially where families are Reduced to a State of Indigence by the Loss of their Relatives --- and therefore it Seems a Singular Instance of Severity and unkind usage to make those who lost their Arms in that desparate attempt on the Battery aforesaid to pay for them which in Effect Punishing instead of Rewarding those who laid down their lives for their Country (and what Effect this may have on others may be worthy Consideration) nor are those who died so, in this Particular Instance the less to be Considered, because they did not Succeed in the Enterprize since they shew their good Will and Courage

for the Public service and thereby Intimidated the Enemy.

This petition captures all the consequences of a soldier's death to those he left behind. It indicates the level of the personal tragedy as well as the economic blow to the family. In this case the joiner expected his son would be his support in his old age, and carry on his trade. The petition even addresses the inequities of the compensation system, hinting that future recruitment could be hurt if the government continued to be parsimonious. This emotional, sagacious and eloquent appeal netted Hugh Montgomery £15.<sup>95</sup>

The treatment and support of wounded soldiers further complicated the war effort for the governments of New Hampshire and New England. Doctors were essential to military operations yet difficult to find and very vulnerable, and beyond the immediate needs of the service medical care was always costly, especially when protracted. However, provincial governments willingly provided for wounded soldiers, and compensated the families of those slain in the service. To fail in this duty would have undermined the whole structure of provincial recruiting. Many provincial soldiers were the economic as well as the emotional support of their families, and some sort of guarantee of financial compensation in case of disaster, no matter how feeble,

---

<sup>95</sup> "Petition of Hugh Montgomery, February 18, 1746," Hammond, ed., NHSP, Vol. XVIII, 260-1

figured in the decision to volunteer. Doctor's bills were paid in full, yearly pensions granted the disabled, or cash paid as compensation for injury and loss. And if the pensions and cash payments amounted to very little, a token acknowledgement in many cases, it was better than nothing.

## CHAPTER TWELVE

### THE LEGACY OF HATE

In addition to the physical suffering, provincial soldiers, like all soldiers in history, faced horrors normally not confronted in every day life. Despite the fact that seventeenth and eighteenth century western society indulged in more physical and public violence than the present age, including public whipping, hanging and even bloodier forms of legal punishment, war still exposed individuals to suffering and cruelty outside the norm. Beyond the emotional loss normally associated with wounds and death in military service, the torture and dismemberment suffered by soldiers and inhabitants at the hands of Indian war parties particularly affected New Englanders. Despite the comfort of their religion, which associated such acts with God's predetermined plan for his chosen people, the psychological consequence of these gruesome displays was a deep and abiding hatred for their Indian foe.

For the majority of New England men and women, religion eased much of the emotional stress of war. The knowledge of God's guiding hand and his predetermined plan for man provided both comfort and understanding. In Providence and

Patriotism in Early America, historian John F. Berens wrote that to New Englanders of the seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries, God controlled all the natural and human occurrences in the universe. "Political and military developments occupied the colonial mind," observed Berens, "but behind them the hand of God was always discerned." The Indian wars were a chastisement, but limited in nature by God. Their ultimate end was not destruction but reformation.<sup>1</sup>

Each victory was explained as God's divine blessing, and New England's ultimate triumph over her enemies was never doubted. According to Cotton Mather, the reluctance of the Indians to engage in hand to hand combat and their tendency to run away from provincial charges was divine providence -- God made the Indians afraid.<sup>2</sup> Mather also believed that although the provincial soldiers could not find the Indian enemy in King William's War, "it is Reported by Returned Captives, That the Hand of God reach'd them, when the Hand of Man could not find them, and a Mortal Sickness did at a Strange Rate carry off multitudes if them."<sup>3</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> John F. Berens, Providence and Patriotism in Early America, 1640-1815 (Charlottesville, VA, 1978), 14-34, quote on page 33.

<sup>2</sup> Cotton Mather, Military Duties Recommended to an Artillery Company, 1687 (Boston, 1687), 14.

<sup>3</sup> Cotton Mather, Decennium Luctuosum (1699, reprinted in Charles H. Lincoln, ed., Narratives of the Indian Wars, 1675-1699, New York, 1913), 259.



The victory at Norridgewock also indicated God's goodness toward his chosen people. The Rev. Benjamin Colman wrote in his preface to Samuel Penhallow's history of the Indian wars, that "In a special manner, the wonderful Victory obtained August 12, 1724, over the bold and Bloody Tribe at Narridgwalk, and their sudden Destruction that Memorable day, was the singular Work of God; And the Officers and Soldiers piously put far from themselves the Honour of it." God sent them the information on where the guards were, and God brought them to village at just the right time. As for the death of the Jesuit, Sabastian Rasle, "he who was the Father of the War, the Ghostly Father of those perfidious Salvages, like Balaam the Son of Beor, was slain among the Enemy, after his vain Endeavors to Curse us."<sup>4</sup>

Such praise for the providence of God was common among all the inhabitants of New England, not just their ministers. After rescuing two boys from their captives in the summer of 1768, one Deerfield man was heard to exclaim "Tis God, and not we, that have wrought this deliverance!"<sup>5</sup> Mary Bulman wrote her husband of the "joyful news of your Safe Victorious Entrence into the City of Cape Briton. Glory to

---

<sup>4</sup> Samuel Penhallow, The History of the Wars of New England with the Eastern Indians (Boston, 1726; Facsimile Reprint, Annotated by Edward Wheelock, Williamstown, MA, 1973), iv.

<sup>5</sup> Mather, Decennium Luctuosum in Lincoln, ed., Narratives of the Indian Wars, 272. Admittedly, it was Cotton Mather who related this story. This religious young man was killed a few minutes later.

God in the Highest who has brought his people in the Strong Holds of our Enemy's with so Little effusion of Blood -- the right hand of the Lord and all mighty arm Hath Done Great things for us where we are blest."<sup>6</sup>

But even more than an explanation of victory, God's direct guidance of all events mitigated the despair of defeat and the pain of death and destruction. Military disasters and personal loss were not viewed as senseless or meaningless, they were part of God's predetermined plan.<sup>7</sup> Cotton Mather believed that with all the careful preparation, energy and prayers put into the Quebec expedition of 1690, "nothing but an Evident Hand of Heaven was likely to have given such a Defeat unto it."<sup>8</sup> An anonymous member of that expedition was more explicit in citing the reasons for

---

<sup>6</sup> "Mary Bulman to Husband, 1745," Maine Historical Society Manuscripts, Vol. I, 20..

<sup>7</sup> Even bizarre and strange occurrences were explained as God's personal intervention. A gunner frustrated with his shooting at Louisbourg exclaimed "God damn me if I don't strike the gate this time!" and was killed almost immediately when a shell fragment split his skull in two. Most interpreted this as judgement for his blasphemous language (See Louis E. De Forest, Louisbourg Journals: 1745 (New York, 1932), 18). When Eleazer Young's musket exploded in his face while on that scout near Lake Winnepesaukee (see Chapter Eleven), "Providence so ordered that the Gun split all in Pieces." It was fortunate for Young that Providence caused the explosion, because the government did not pay compensation for guns lost through the owners neglect, such as improper cleaning or loading ("Petition of Eleazer Young, Jr. Dec 14, 1744," Isaac Hammond, ed., Documents Relating to Towns in New Hampshire, "A" to "F" Inclusive (Concord, 1882) New Hampshire Provincial and State Papers, Vol. XI, 514).

<sup>8</sup> Mather, Decennium Luctuosum in Lincoln, ed., Narratives of the Indian Wars, 214.

the failure. God gave the Iroquois small pox which stopped the attack on Montreal. God sent contrary winds to delay Phips' fleet. God brought Frontenac into the city with 3,000 men just before the English arrived, the report of which so terrified the faint-hearted John Walley. God sent diseases into the provincial army. However, the author of this interpretation pointed that God expects the righteous to suffer before he gives them final victory.<sup>9</sup>

The destruction of frontier communities provided further evidence of God's wrath. After the attack on York, Maine in January, 1692, the inhabitants of Wells told the Bay government that "God is still manifesting his displeasure against this Land, he who formerly hath set to his hand to help us, doth even write bitter things against us. The course of God's most sweet and rich promises, and gracious providences may justly be interrupted by the sins of his People."<sup>10</sup> The death of York's minister in that attack was perceived as a particular sign of God's "dreadfull displeasure agaynst us."<sup>11</sup>

---

<sup>9</sup> Anon, "Phips Expedition to Canada," Proceedings of the Massachusetts Historical Society, Second Series, Vol. XV, 317.

<sup>10</sup> "Rev. George Burrough, et. al. to Governor and Council, January 27, 1692," James Phinney Baxter, ed., Documentary History of the State of Maine, (Portland, ME, 1897), Collections of the Maine Historical Society, 2nd Series, Vol. V, 316-17.

<sup>11</sup> "Francis Hooke to Governor and Council, January 28, 1692," Baxter, ed., Doc. Hist. Me., Vol. V, 317-18.

New Englanders also turned to thoughts of God's judgment to console the loss of family and friends. When he heard of the death of Charles Frost, the popular community and military leader from Kittery ambushed while returning from church in 1697, Joseph Storer of Wells exclaimed "The good Lord keep us in these perilous times! The good Lord sanctify it to us all!"<sup>12</sup> In late September the Rev. Benjamin Colman and his wife wrote to William Pepperrell at Louisbourg and acknowledged the death of Alexander Bulman. The Colmans, like Pepperrell, knew the Bulmans, and indicated Mary Bulman's faith would sustain her in this loss. "His dear and lovely spouse spent a day with us this week," they wrote, "and is returned home. Our hearts bleed for her when the evil tidings reach her. But her heart is fortified by Grace."<sup>13</sup>

The religious beliefs of New Englanders may have alleviated some of the psychological wounds of war. Today it is common to refer to psychological impact of war, such

---

<sup>12</sup> Samuel Adams Drake, The Border Wars of New England, Commonly called King William's and Queen Anne's Wars (1897, reprint of 1910 edition, Williamstown, MA, 1973), 131.

<sup>13</sup> "Pepperrell Papers," Collections of the Massachusetts Historical Society, Series VI, Vol. X (1899), 371-3. Mary Bulman would later marry a minister from Cambridge. A full set of bed hangings embroidered in crewel by Mary Bulman are on display at the Old York Historical Society in York, Maine. An old legend claimed she did them while waiting for her husband's return from Louisbourg, but experts have correctly pointed out that the embroidery probably took ten years to complete. It is now conjectured that she did them after the death of Alexander Bulman.

as Post-Vietnam Syndrome. Modern soldiers have trouble adjusting to peace. They leave the military with a feeling of guilt -- guilt that they have survived when so many close friends did not, guilt at being part of a system of senseless waste. Modern soldiers may miss the fellowship, but they view war's irrational bloodshed and destruction with abhorrence.<sup>14</sup> However, there is little evidence of this abhorrence of warfare in principle among provincial soldiers, and this may have resulted from the belief that the bloodshed and destruction was not senseless, but part of God's ultimate designs.

This does not mean many provincial soldiers rejected their military service experience, but the rejection emanated from perceived abuses by authorities or disappointment at expected rewards. When Theodore Atkinson found himself commanding New Hampshire soldiers raised for an expedition that never materialized, he wrote in June, 1746 that he had "10000 times repented my being Perswaded into an Inlistment however tis now too late." But Atkinson was disgruntled over the failure of the British to arrive, and over his low pay.<sup>15</sup> Similarly, the soldiers who left Louisbourg vowing

---

<sup>14</sup> For a discussion of this aspect see Richard Holmes, Acts of War: The Behavior of Men in Battle (New York, 1985), 394-405; John Keegan and Richard Holmes, Soldiers: A History of Men in Battle (New York, 1985), 276; Alexander Kendrick, The Wound Within: America in the Vietnam Years, 1945-1974 (Boston, 1974), 320-1.

<sup>15</sup> "Atkinson to Tomlinson, June 6, 1746," Isaac Hammond, ed., Miscellaneous Provincial and State Papers (Manchester, NH, 1890) New Hampshire Provincial and State Papers, Vol. XVIII, 310-11.

never to serve again did so because of broken promises and lack of plunder.<sup>16</sup> Almost no evidence exists of any provincial soldiers refusing further service due to moral indignation.<sup>17</sup>

But the belief in both predestination and God's active participation in the affairs of man only went so far in easing the psychological wounds of war. Despite the fact that Cotton Mather said "The Almighty God is to be acknowledg'd as the Author of whatsoever Military Skill or Strength any children of men do excel in," Providence provided no excuses for individual failure.<sup>18</sup> John Walley, Pasco Chubb and Benjamin Hassell could not blame God as the author

---

<sup>16</sup> See Chapter Five and Seven.

<sup>17</sup> One possible exception might be Thomas Westbrook Waldron, of Dover, New Hampshire. As his name indicates, Waldron was descended from two prominent military families, which included Richard Waldron, an officer in King Philip's War and object of Indian revenge in 1689, and Thomas Westbrook, commander of provincial forces on the Maine frontier in Dummer's War. Thomas Waldron served as an officer in the New Hampshire regiment at Louisbourg, and co-authored a letter to the New Hampshire government detailing the appalling conditions of the men, including their near nakedness, poor food and unwarranted extended stay ("Statement of the Conditions of the Men At Louisbourg," Hammond, ed., NHSP, Vol. XVIII, 238-9). Waldron's exposure to eighteenth military life at Louisbourg may have caused him to reject war and military service. Despite the history of provincial service on both sides of his family, Waldron would never again serve in a military capacity, although he would hold political office. Of course, the reasons for his rejection of military service can only be speculated on, a speculation probably tainted by that modern pre-occupation with the psychological impact of war referred to earlier.

<sup>18</sup> Mather, Decennium Luctuosum in Lincoln, ed., Narratives of the Indian Wars, 7.

of their actions. No one doubted that the New England Puritans were God's chosen people, as such would emerge triumphant, but, as Robert Pike observed in 1689, "we may be a peopl saved of the Lord though a peopl that distroy ourselves."<sup>19</sup> Therefore, the actions of cowards worked in opposition to God's ultimate triumph. Men like Walley, Chubb and Hassell were part of God's affliction on his chosen people.

The Indians were another manifestation of God's displeasure. In 1691 the inhabitants of Wells believed that God "let loose the heathen upon us by holden us off from our improvements, keeping us close in garrison."<sup>20</sup> The Rev. Benjamin Colman observed that God had planted his people in the New World, "Yet to humbly and prove us, and for our Sins to punish us, the Righteous God hath left a sufficient Number of the fierce and barbarous Salvages on our borders, to be pricks in our Eyes, and thorns in our sides, and they have been and are like the Boar of the Woods to waste us, and the Wild Beasts of the field to devour us."<sup>21</sup> Samuel Penhallow believed the English had no one to blame for the Indian attacks but themselves. "God has made them a terrible Scourge for the punishment of our Sins," wrote Penhal-

---

<sup>19</sup> "Letter of Robert Pike, July 29, 1689," James Phinney Baxter, ed., Documentary History of the State of Maine (Portland, ME, 1907), Collections of the Maine Historical Society, 2nd Series, Vol. IX, 24.

<sup>20</sup> Edward F. Bourne, The History of Wells and Kennebunk (Portland, ME, 1875), 209.

<sup>21</sup> Penhallow, History of the Wars of New England, ii.

low, "And probably that very Sin of ours in neglecting the welfare of their Souls."<sup>22</sup>

For the devout and impious alike, the horrors of Indian war made a deep and lasting impression. Provincial soldiers and local pursuit forces often came on unbelievably gruesome scenes. When Captain Johnson Harmon and his scouting company surprised and killed some fifteen odd Indians in 1722, they found the hand of an Englishman near the camp. A quick search discovered the body of Moses Eaton of Salisbury laid on the stump of a tree, "having his Tongue, Nose and private parts cut off."<sup>23</sup> Besides such descriptions of dismemberment, stories of people roasted and partially eaten, such as Robert Rogers of Salmon Falls in 1690 and William Moody of Exeter in 1709, made lasting impressions as well.<sup>24</sup>

But the killing of pregnant women seemed to provoke the greatest indignation. In this respect the death of Goody Webber in 1703 proved particularly prominent.<sup>25</sup> A resident of Perpooduck, Webber was one of the victims of the massive attack on Maine communities on August 10, 1703. A letter

---

<sup>22</sup> Penhallow, History of the Wars of New England, vi.

<sup>23</sup> Penhallow, History of the Wars of New England, 87.

<sup>24</sup> For the incident of Robert Rogers, see Mather, Decennium Luctuosum in Lincoln, ed., Narratives of the Indian Wars, 207, and for William Moody, see Penhallow, History of the Wars of New England, 48-9.

<sup>25</sup> Goody Webber was by no means the only pregnant women cut up by Indians. A woman at Oyster River in 1694 died in a similar manner. See Jeremy Belknap, The History of New Hampshire (Reprint of 1831 edition, New York, 1970) Vol 1, 138-9.



describing the results of the assault reported that the Indians "ript up one Goody Webber that was big with child and laid her child to her breast and so left her. At Spurwink river they knockt one Jordans sucking Childs brains out against a Tree."<sup>26</sup> Samuel Penhallow vividly described the incident twenty-two years later in his history of Queen Anne's and Dummer's Wars,<sup>27</sup> and Benjamin Church, in explaining the purpose of his 1704 raid and providing justification for both the enthusiasm of recruits and the events which transpired, referred to the fate of Goody Webber and other victims of Indian brutality.

To see a woman that those barbarous savages had taken and killed, exposed in a most brutish manner (as can be expressed) with a young child seized fast with strings to her breast. [The] infant had no apparent wound, which doubtless was left alive to suck its dead mother's breast, and so miserably to perish and die.... Another instance was, of a straggling soldier, who was found at Casco, exposed in a shameful and barbarous manner. His body being staked up, his head cut off, and a hog's head set in the room; his body ripped up, and heart and inwards taken out, and private members cut off, and hung with belts of their own, the inwards

---

<sup>26</sup> "Letter from John Hornabeck, 1703," Baxter, ed., Doc. Hist. Me., Vol. IX, 178-9.

<sup>27</sup> Penhallow, History of the Wars of New England, 6.

at one side of his body, and his privates at another, in scorn and derision of the English soldiers.<sup>28</sup>

When Church and Penhallow published such descriptions in their histories, when ministers like Cotton Mather and Benjamin Wadsworth preached in their sermons how the Indians have "horribly Murdered some Scores of your dear Countrymen, whose Blood cries in your Ears," and how inhabitants of the frontier have witnessed "Children dashed against the stones" and "Women with Child ripped open", they were following a common practice in the history of war called dehumanizing the enemy.<sup>29</sup> Richard Holmes observed that the dehumanization of the enemy enables soldiers to distinguish killing in battle from murder, and that "racial and cultural differences accelerate this process."<sup>30</sup> The savagery of the Indian was likened to wild beasts, and the tactics of *petite guerre*, which employed hunting techniques, enforced this concept.<sup>31</sup>

---

<sup>28</sup> Thomas Church, The History of the Great Indian War of 1675 and 1676 Commonly called Philip's War, also, The Old French and Indian Wars, from 1689 to 1704 (Hartford, Conn, 1845 edition, orig. pub. 1716), 244.

<sup>29</sup> Mather, Decennium Luctuosum in Lincoln, ed., Narratives of the Indian Wars, 28; Benjamin Wadsworth, Good Souldiers A Great Blessing (Boston, 1700), 22.

<sup>30</sup> Holmes, Acts of War, 360-66.

<sup>31</sup> Richard Slotkin found that in the literature of the period, the "exorcism of the Indians is likened to the hunting down and slaying of rapid beasts embodying all qualities of evil." Slotkin found that after convincing themselves Indians were wild animals, some New Englanders had trouble accepting that their soldiers

But if Indians should be exterminated as rabid wolves, then surely that would include all natives as well. However, New Englanders frequently used Plymouth Indians and Mohawks as allies, so the designation of Indians as savage animals does not fully explain the extreme hatred displayed toward the Eastern tribes. It was the labeling of the latter as "rebels" and "traitors" which made the difference, because in warfare the enemy often earned respect, clemency and fair treatment according to "civilized" codes of honor, but traitors and rebels deserved no such consideration.

The treatment of Scottish Highlanders by the British army in 1746 provides one contemporary example of this view. While New England captured and garrisoned the French fortress of Louisbourg, the English army fought against the last

---

used the same tactics. This would change during the early years of the eighteenth century, and Slotkin believed Benjamin Church was a pivotal figure in the transition between the generations (Richard Slotkin, Regeneration Through Violence: The Mythology of the American Frontier, 1600-1860 (Middletown, CN, 1973), 154-65). The nineteenth century historian Samuel Adams Drake recognized this depiction of Indians as animals, and wrestled with his conscience over it as much as any Puritan. Drake felt that scalp bounties brought "into the conflict the new, and to this later generation repugnant, incentive of private gain. This was treating Indians and wolves alike. It was even more; for thus to authorize the forming of scalping parties was to put those engaging in them on a level with the savages themselves. Yet public feeling had reached a point when no more was thought of killing an Indian than a wolf. ... The Rev. Solomon Stoddard, minister of Northampton, venerated for his virtues, who lived in the midst of hostile alarms, declared that the Indians should be looked upon only as 'thieves and murderers,' and he proposed hunting them down with dogs 'the same as we do bears,' as the best and only way of tracking them to their dens." See Drake, The Border Wars of New England, 166)

Stuart pretender to the throne, Charles Edward Stuart. Bonnie Prince Charlie's army consisted mainly of gaelic speaking clansmen from the Highlands of Scotland who represented a culture as alien to the English as their colonists found in the native Americans. After the bloody defeat of Bonnie Prince Charlie's army at the Battle of Culloden in April, 1746, wounded Highlanders were systematically slaughtered on the field of battle, and the English army spent the next few months "pacifying" the Highlands with sword, musket and hangman's rope. There was no thought given to mercy because these strange wildmen were traitors and rebels to the crown. As one English volunteer expressed it, "this rebel host had been most deeply in debt to the publick for all the rapine, murder and cruelty; and since the time was now come to pay off the score, our people were all glad to clear the reckoning, and heartily determined to give them receipt in full."<sup>22</sup> This sentiment could easily have been expressed by a New England provincial soldier.

Like the New Englanders and their Indian allies, the British army employed Highland units in their army, so the cultural differences by themselves were not enough to pinpoint the target of retribution, it was the designation as traitors and rebels coupled with the cultural aspects that

---

<sup>22</sup> John Prebble, Culloden (Penguin Books, New York, 1967), 116. Prebble's book provides the best description of English reaction to the Stuart rebellion.

intensified the bitter enmity.<sup>33</sup> The policy concerning Indian tribes in colonial New England is strewn with contradictions. They were viewed as a separate political unit requiring formal declarations of war and peace treaties, yet they were also considered subjects of the King.<sup>34</sup> Thus when Samuel Shute declared war on the Eastern Indian tribes in 1722, he declared "the said Eastern Indians, with their Confederates, to be Robbers, Traitors and Enemies to his Majesty King George." They were traitors by virtue of their "repeated Submissions to his Majesty's Crown and Government."<sup>35</sup> Therefore, as traitors to the Crown, and as savage beasts, the Eastern Indians deserved no mercy or consideration.<sup>36</sup>

One manifestation of this hatred can be seen in the killing of Indian prisoners. Richard Holmes and John Keegan

---

<sup>33</sup> Like the cultural differences, the designation of rebel or traitor alone did not usually produce such deep feelings. The rebels in the thirteen colonies were treated with tremendous civility and tolerance by the British army when compared to the treatment of the Highland rebels. Rebels they may have been, but they were also kinsmen. So it was the combination of the two which produced the extreme reaction.

<sup>34</sup> For the early precedents for this arrangement, see Alden T. Vaughn, New England Frontier: Puritans and Indians, 1620-1675 (Boston, 1965).

<sup>35</sup> Quoted in Penhallow, History of the Wars of New England, 88-89. Similar language was used in 1755 by the Governor of New Hampshire, when he declared the Eastern Indians "to be Enemies, Rebels and Traitors to his most Sacred Majesty." ("Proclamation against some Indians, 1755," Hammond, ed., NHSP, Vol. XVIII, 427-8).

<sup>36</sup> A third strike against the Eastern Indians involved their form of warfare. Richard Holmes has indicated that guerilla warfare, the war of ambush and surprise, has always increased the intensity of feeling. See Holmes, Acts of War, 387.

have pointed out the tricky business of surrendering in battle, as Holmes wrote. it is "more difficult to train soldiers in the exercise of deliberate restraint than it is to imbue them with combative zeal."<sup>37</sup> During the initial fight between the provincial soldiers and the French at Quebec in 1690, the Rev. John Wise remembered that a French officer tried to surrender to John March as the New Englanders chased the fleeing enemy. "Capt. March perceiving it beat back his Men and did what he could.... but could not be obeyed [as] Things were in such an hurry [the Frenchman] was shot dead."<sup>38</sup> During an attack on a village in 1704, Benjamin Church saw a group of soldiers standing around a hut. When his men told him there were people in the house who would not come out, "I hastily bid them pull it down, and *knock them on the head*, never asking whether they were French or Indians; they being all enemies to me."<sup>39</sup> Such occurrences are common in all battles where successful surrender depends so much on timing.

However, provincial soldiers never bothered to take Indian prisoners in action,<sup>40</sup> and rarely kept male Indian

<sup>37</sup> Holmes, Acts of War, 367.

<sup>38</sup> "Narrative of Mr. John Wise, Minister of God's Word at Chebacco," Proceedings of the Massachusetts Historical Society, Vol XV, 288.

<sup>39</sup> Church, The History of the Great Indian War, 265.

<sup>40</sup> For example, in the assault on Norridgewock in 1724, one of the three Mohawks with the provincial force was killed by a shot from a wigwam by a Chief called Mog. Another Mohawk broke down the door and killed Mog, while "the English, in their rage, followed and killed

captives found alive after an engagement. It was beyond the heat of battle where the intense hatred of New Englanders manifested itself in the almost routine killing of male prisoners. Such executions, as well as the disregard of Indian flags of truce, often brought the censure of contemporary civilians and subsequent historians, but it continued nonetheless, with apparently little remorse. In 1690, Benjamin Church captured a small Indian fort near Pejepscot, releasing five white captives and taking about eleven Indian prisoners. In questioning one of the male prisoners, "the soldiers being very rude, would hardly spare the Indian's life," and obviously intended to kill him. The white captives pleaded for the Indian because he had helped them during their captivity. Church burned the village and crops, and ordered the killing of the prisoners except two squaws and the helpful male. However, during the march back his soldiers, apparently both white and red, continued to harass and threaten the lone male Indian prisoner until he finally escaped.<sup>41</sup>

In 1694, John March seized three prominent chiefs who approached Fort William Henry under a flag of truce and sent them to prison in Boston. To March, the Indians abrogated their right to the normal customs of due to their status as traitors and beasts. A year and a half later Pasco Chubb

---

the poor squaw and two helpless children." See Thomas Hutchinson, The History of the Colony and Province of Massachusetts Bay (London, 1768; reprint Cambridge, MA, 1936), 237.

<sup>41</sup> Church, The History of the Great Indian War, 187-9.

also ignored a truce flag and killed four Indians, two of them chiefs.<sup>42</sup> In October, 1710, a scouting party under Shadrach Walton caught an Indian party clamming on the Maine coast. One of the captives proved to be a chief from Norridgewock. When questioned about the whereabouts of other clamming parties, the chief "made no Reply, and when they threatened him with Death, he laughed at it with contempt." Walton turned the chief over to his friendly Indians who promptly killed him, and this action loosened the tongue of the dead chief's wife.<sup>43</sup>

Once instilled the killing habit is often difficult to break, and the difficulty increases where race and culture divide two enemies. Even when a war stops, hatred may not disappear. Normally at the conclusion of a war, the combatants withdraw behind established national borders and therefore further contact is limited. Such was the case in New England where the English colonists, outside those directly involved in trade, and little contact with their French counterparts to the north. Richard Holmes found that the "concept of a hateful and inhuman enemy rarely survives

---

<sup>42</sup> According to that latter day Puritan historian, Samuel Adams Drake, "for thus putting himself on a level with savages, Chubb unaccountably escaped formal censure, perhaps, as Mather naively remarks, because some well enough liked the thing that was done, although they did not like the manner of doing it. To his credit be it said, Mather was not enough of a Jesuit to stomach such unpardonable baseness." See The Border Wars of New England, 108.

<sup>43</sup> Penhallow, History of the War of New England, 60.



contact with him as an individual."<sup>44</sup> This enlightenment can occur during wars where formal and informal truces between battles allowed curiosity to blossom into peaceful encounters with the foe, or it can happen sometime after the conclusion of peace settlements.<sup>45</sup>

However, even Richard Holmes had to admit that this forgiveness and understanding could be blocked in situations where race or culture were involved. Holmes found that British soldiers who fought the Japanese in World War II, particularly those who became prisoners, have little forgiveness in their hearts for their former foe. "If one of them passed by this minute," said one British veteran, "I would cheerfully saw his head off and roll it in the gutter."<sup>46</sup> Additionally, the connotation of an enemy as a traitor inhibits reconciliation. For example, civil wars, where the combatants live intermixed and there can be no separation between wars, produce a bitterness rarely softened by time. As in the case of the American Revolution, the losers often have to leave the country to escape retribution.

For New Englanders, especially those living on the frontier, separation with the Eastern Indians between wars was rarely possible. Although their villages were beyond

---

<sup>44</sup> Holmes, Acts of War, 368.

<sup>45</sup> Holmes, Acts of War, 268-9; Keegan and Holmes, Soldiers, 268-70.

<sup>46</sup> Holmes, Acts of War, 374.

the frontier line of English communities, the Eastern Indians were frequent visitors. As they came to trade, or passed through on their travels, Indians asked for food and shelter from the English colonists. It was during such interaction that red and white men came to know each other personally, but this familiarity did not breed understanding. Hugh McLellan, the turn of the century local historian who wrote a history of Gorham, Maine, related a family legend that while his ancestors continued to feed travelling Indians who stopped by, they never liked or trusted them.<sup>47</sup>

The wars between the English provinces and the Eastern tribes were in effect civil wars, as the designation of the Indians as traitors and rebels indicates. The additional cultural and racial differences did little to alleviate the animosity New Englanders felt toward the Indians. As historian Charles Clark indicated, "the only certainty was a permanent and deeply felt hostility between the two races, nurtured since the time of King Philip's War by treachery and savagery on both sides, which could not be ended by a peace treaty."<sup>48</sup> Early in the nineteenth century, New Hampshire historian Jeremy Belknap was even more specific in describing this ill will. Belknap found that by the end of

---

<sup>47</sup> Hugh D. McLellan, History of Gorham, Maine (Portland, ME, 1903)

<sup>48</sup> Charles E. Clark, The Eastern Frontier: The Settlement of Northern New England, 1610-1763 (New York, 1970), 117.

Dummer's War, provincials had not only become adept at frontier warfare,

They had also imbibed from their infancy a strong antipathy to the savage natives; which was strengthened by repeated horrors of blood and desolation, and not obliterated by the intercourse which they had with them in time of peace. As the Indians frequently resorted to the frontier towns in time of scarcity, it was common for them to visit the families whom they had injured in war; to recount the circumstances of death and torture which had been practised on their friends; and when provoked or intoxicated, to threaten a repetition of such insults in future wars. To bear such treatment required more than human patience; and it is not improbable that secret murders were sometimes the consequence of these harsh provocations. Certain it is, that when any person was arrested, for killing an Indian in time of peace, he was either forcibly rescued from the hands of justice, or if brought to trial, invariably acquitted; it being impossible to impanel a jury, some of whom had not suffered by the Indians, either in their persons or families.<sup>49</sup>

The latter probably refers to an incident which took place in Maine at the end of King George's War which illus-

---

<sup>49</sup> Belknap, History of New Hampshire, 218.

trates the legacy of hate that was the principle psychological wound suffered by both provincial soldiers and the inhabitants of the frontier. In October, 1748, the Treaty of Aix-la-Chapelle ended the conflict between the English and French, however, the provincial governments of New England would not formally conclude their war with the Eastern tribes for another year. After a preliminary peace conference held in Boston in June, 1749, the delegates of both sides met at Falmouth, Maine in October to sign the peace treaty. Among the provisions of the treaty was the stipulation that private quarrels and grievances would be settled through the courts in order to prevent the gradual escalation of violence which had always led to war.<sup>50</sup>

On December 2, six white men attacked a small party of Indians near Wiscasset, Maine, resulting in the death of one brave and the wounding of two others. Four days later, two of the squaws, including the widow of the slain man, arrived at the home of Sheriff Samuel Denny in Georgetown to report the attack. Soon after a deputy sheriff, Samuel Harnden, and two others arrived to report the same incident. Denny issued warrants for the arrest of the accused men, but fearing that "the matter might [not] be properly managed", went himself to supervise the arrests. He also sent someone to help the wounded Indians "in order to quiet them and for

---

<sup>50</sup> "Letter William Lithgow, February 2, 1749," James Phinney Baxter, ed., Documentary History of the State of Maine (Portland, ME, 1916), Collections of the Maine Historical Society, 2nd Series, Vol. XXIII, 352-4.

their support and ... if possible to keep them from informing the other Indians." The situation was obviously explosive.

Two of the accused turned themselves into Denny and two others were arrested by Harnden, but the deputy sheriff told Denny that "a mob was ris to rescu them. I went with him to the plase and on our landing was met by a number of armed men with their fases disgise by being blacked. I declared who I was and went a shore on which a fray arose in which I was knocked down and had sum slite wounds but we subdued them." Denny arrested five of the six men involved in the murder and detained those who had attempted to prevent their capture. All men apparently came off a small vessel anchored nearby. The sixth man accused of killing the Indian, Obediah Albee, Jr., made his escape and was believed to be on his way home to Massachusetts. Denny informed the Bay government that fourteen Indians, "young and old", were destitute because of this "axadente."<sup>51</sup>

On December 13, an *ad hoc* committee of the Massachusetts House of Representatives established to study Denny's report recommended that the accused be brought to Cambridge for trial as the court in York was not scheduled to meet until June and this might allow the prisoners time to escape. They also recommended that a proclamation be issued for the arrest of Obediah Albee, that a surgeon be sent to aid the Indians and that relief be provided for those

---

<sup>51</sup> "Samuel Denny to Governor, December 9, 1749," Baxter, ed., Doc. Hist. Me., Vol. XXIV, 338-40.

relatives in need. The House concurred in all recommendations except they voted to hold the trial in Maine, ordering that the prisoners be transferred to the jail in York.<sup>52</sup>

Meanwhile, Samuel Denny released the men who had attempted the rescue, and determined that of the six involved in the original incident, Benjamin Ledite and Samuel Ball, along with the missing Albee, were actually at fault. Denny started Ball and Ledite on their journey to York and retained the other three men as witnesses.<sup>53</sup> On December 22, Sheriff Joseph Blany of Marblehead reported that he had captured Obediah Albee. An informant told Blany where Albee was, and Blany encouraged the informant to apprehend Albee so he could claim the reward, but "they Declined to do so saying they Desired to have nothing to do in affair." Blany had one of his deputies arrest Albee and lodged him in the Salem jail.<sup>54</sup>

The following day, however, the best laid plans of the Bay government fell apart as the other five men, Samuel Ball, Benjamin Ledite and the three witnesses, all escaped. The sheriffs of Suffolk, Middlesex, Worcester and Bristol counties were alerted to search for and apprehend the five men. A reward of £50 was offered for them, and £25 for

---

<sup>52</sup> "Committee Report, Dec. 13, 1749," Baxter, ed., Doc. Hist. Me., Vol. XXIV, 340-42.

<sup>53</sup> "S. Frost to Governor, Dec. 22, 1749," Baxter, ed., Doc. Hist. Me., Vol. XXIV, 342-3.

<sup>54</sup> "Joseph Blany to Spenser Phips, December 22, 1749," Baxter, ed., Doc. Hist. Me., Vol. XXIV, 343. Blany said he thought he was entitled to the reward.

anyone known to have aided in their escape. The government believed that in the case of Ball and Ledite, who escaped while staying in Falmouth, the deputy sheriff transporting the prisoners was either negligent, or sympathetic to the prisoners, and they instructed the Justice of the Peace in Falmouth, Jabez Fox, to issue a warrant for the sheriff's arrest.<sup>55</sup>

On January 1, Fox reported the details of the prisoners' escape at Falmouth. On the snowy night of December 15, at about eleven o'clock in the evening, Ball and Ledite were released "by Sundry persons that appeared in a Mobbish manner" at the house about two miles outside of town where the prisoners were spending the night. The mob took the men into the woods where pursuit was impossible due to the snow storm. Fox issued warrants for their arrest and blanketed the region with handbills describing the prisoners.<sup>56</sup> Fox attempted to discover who had been in the mob which released the men, but had little success. On December 30, Fox learned that the men had been seen at Gorham and so ordered an officer "with a strong guard all

---

<sup>55</sup> "House of Representatives, December 29, 1749," Baxter, ed., Doc. Hist. Me., Vol. XXIV, 345-6.

<sup>56</sup> The hand bills described Samuel Ball as "a man of Midling Stature with a full eye of a Light Compelection he wears his own Hair, he had on a Blue Cloth Jackett, Blue Stockings, an old Hatt and Trousers. He has been Lately seen with a Frock over his Jackett." Benjamin Ledite was "of a small Stature Full Eyed, dark coloured Hair, he had on a Stone Grey great Coat, yarn Stockings, old Shoes and an old Hatt." - Baxter, ed., Doc. Hist. Me., Vol. XXIV, 347.

armed ... to Search every House in said Town." Fox was told the men had arrived in Gorham on the 16th and had been sheltered there until the 27th.<sup>57</sup>

On January 11, Jeremiah Moulton, the hero of Norridgewock and now Sheriff of York County, reported that he had the two men safely incarcerated in the York jail. Moulton had strengthened the jail and hired nine armed guards to watch over them.<sup>58</sup> On January 16 the House of Representatives announced that the three accused men, Samuel Ball, Benjamin Ledite and Obediah Albee, were being held for trial, and a few days later the Governor proclaimed that a special court would meet in York on February 22 to hear the case.<sup>59</sup> However, due to illness, only two judges were able

---

<sup>57</sup> "Jabez Fox to Governor, January 1, 1750," Baxter, ed., Doc. Hist. Me., Vol. XXIV, 347-49.

<sup>58</sup> "Jeremiah Moulton to Governor, January 11, 1750," Baxter, ed., Doc. Hist. Me., Vol. XXIV, 349-50. The men turned themselves in at a trading house in Saco. The Rev. Thomas Smith of Falmouth recorded in his diary on January 11 that "There has been a great uproar about the men that killed the Indians at Witchcassit, they have been rescued by some of our people from the officers, and today after surrendering themselves to Capt. Bean, at Truck House, were carried to York." See Journals of the Rev. Thomas Smith and the Rev. Samuel Deane (Portland, ME, 1849), 141.

<sup>59</sup> "House of Representatives, January 16, 1750," Baxter, ed., Doc. Hist. Me., Vol. XXIV, 337; "Governor's Proclamation, January 22, 1750," Baxter, ed., Doc. Hist. Me., Vol. XXIV, 350-2; The Rev. Smith recorded on January 22 that "A Special Supreme Court at York for the trial of the men that killed the Indian." Journals of the Rev. Smith and Rev. Deane, 142.



to travel to York, so the trial had to be postponed until the regular session in June.<sup>60</sup>

The delays caused by the rescues and the illness of the judges began to create considerable apprehension among provincial officers at Fort St. George, the most exposed fort on the Maine frontier. The Indians had been told that such transgressions would be punished but there was little evidence of this. In January the widow of the slain Indian was given two blankets, one for herself and one to bury her husband in "as ... it was their custom." She was also given other supplies as well.<sup>61</sup> In April Lieutenant Jabez Bradbury wrote from Fort St. George asking why there had been no trial, and expressed the opinion that "if there is not speedy satisfaction Given to the Indians on that account it may be attended with ill Consequences."<sup>62</sup> The Indian chiefs concerned also wrote the government to express their disappointment at the delay, reminding the Bay government of the promises made in the treaty signed the previous October. Asserremo, Chief of the Worranoek Indians, indicated his

---

<sup>60</sup> "Richard Saltonstall and Stephen Sewell to Governor, Council and Assembly, February 5, 1750," Baxter, ed., Doc. Hist. Me., Vol. XXIV, 352; "Jeremiah Moulton to Governor, February 24, 1750," Baxter, ed., Doc. Hist. Me., Vol. XXIV, 325. Moulton recommended the number of guards be reduced to three as he did not anticipate any trouble unless the men were actually convicted; "Edward Trowbridge to Governor, March 8, 1750," Baxter, ed., Doc. Hist. Me., Vol. XXIV, 325-6.

<sup>61</sup> "Letter William Lithgow, February 2, 1750," Baxter, ed., Doc. Hist. Me., Vol. XXIV, 352-4.

<sup>62</sup> "Lt. Jabez Bradbury to Governor, April 9, 1750," Baxter, ed., Doc. Hist. Me., Vol. XXIV, 327.

young men "would have you be Quick in putting thos murderers to Death within a months time to cover the blood that now lyes on the ground which we are Desirous may be covered or else all will not be well."<sup>63</sup> The government could only instruct their officers to explain the intricacies of the English court system to the Indians as best they could, and wait for June.

Obediah Albee, considered the main instigator in the attack, came to trial first. Albee was transferred from Salem to York in mid-June, where a jury, "chosen by the Towns in that County", acquitted him of all charges.<sup>64</sup> The government now found itself in a quandary, trapped between appeasing the Indians to prevent a war and the obvious feelings of their own people. They knew the other two men would be acquitted as well, and they also knew the Indians would never understand why. As a result, they delayed the inevitable. Ball and Ledite were transferred to a jail in Middlesex County, but the vote in the House transferring the trial from York to Suffolk county was defeated on the third reading. The prisoners were later transferred back to York but their trial was apparently never held, and their ulti-

---

<sup>63</sup> "Indian letters, April 17. 1750," Baxter, ed., Doc. Hist. Me., Vol. XXIV, 328-9.

<sup>64</sup> "Governor's Message to Indians, August 8, 1750," Baxter, ed., Doc. Hist. Me., Vol. XXIV, 335; The Rev. Smith wrote in his journal on June 15, "I rode to York. Albee was acquitted to the great surprise of the Court, who continued the other two prisoners to be removed for a trial elsewhere. This unhappy affair gives this country an ill name, and it is feared will bring on a war." Journals of the Rev. Smith and Rev. Deane, 143.

mate fate unknown. The Indians harbored the injury until the outbreak of the next war.<sup>65</sup>

This incident denotes the depth of feeling instilled by the long wars with the Indians. Despite the fact that war had brought nothing but death, captivity and destruction to the frontier, most of the inhabitants were willing to risk a new outbreak in order to prevent the punishment of three men for killing an Indian. The mob which freed Samuel Ball and Benjamin Ledite at Falmouth, the residents of Gorham who sheltered them for eleven days, and the jury which acquitted Obediah Albee clearly indicated where their sentiments lay. Jabez Fox could not understand the actions of the people living in Gorham, a town which had experienced the fury of the enemy just a few years earlier. As he told the authorities in Boston, "I must say I am exceedingly surprised to find such a spirit almost universally prevailing amongst those that live the most Exposed to the Indian Enemy in Warr time, as there seems to be at present to secure murderers from the hands of Justice."<sup>66</sup>

Even more interesting perhaps is that both Benjamin Ledite and Samuel Ball had been provincial soldiers, and the stories they told Jeremiah Moulton hint at the psychological wounds of war. Moulton apparently questioned the two men extensively after they surrendered themselves in early

---

<sup>65</sup> Journals of the Rev. Smith and Rev. Deane, 141 Note.

<sup>66</sup> "Letter from Jabez Fox, January 1, 1750," Baxter, ed., Doc. Hist. Me., Vol. XXIV, 349.

January. Both naturally pleaded innocent to the charge of murdering the Indian at Wiscasset, and appeared to have been just as startled at their rescue in Falmouth as the officers they were taken from. Moulton reported the two men "were unexpectedly surprized out of their sleep there and carried off in the night and bid to go about their business by a Number of Persons all unknown to them." Benjamin Ledite told the sheriff that he was originally from Seekonk, Massachusetts, and had "been out sometime in the Province Service in this country as a Soldier in the late Indian Warr." Samuel Ball, who Moulton referred to as a "Transient Person", declared that "his father was killed by the Indians the first of the war and himself for the most part been improved as a Soldier ever since." Moulton indicated Ball had served in Nova Scotia and gave the impression he had spent most of King George's War in provincial service.<sup>67</sup>

Like Richard Holmes' British veteran whose enmity toward the Japanese remained unabated, it is possible that some provincial soldiers retained the killing habit even after the war had been concluded. In the Northern Colonial Frontier, 1607-1763, Douglas Leach observed that the "daily perils of life on the frontier colored the pattern of pioneer character." Opposing forces learned to despise each other, and while some historians have blamed the Indians for

---

<sup>67</sup> "Letter from Jeremiah Moulton, January 11, 1750," Baxter, ed., Doc. Hist. Me., Vol. XXIV, 349-50. Ball's family had been in Maine when his father was killed, but afterward his mother and siblings returned "to the Westward in or about Dunstable where they first came from."

being savages, and others have condemned the English as insensitive racists, the problem was not so simple. Leach correctly pointed out that the Indians were indeed victimized, by both New France and New England, but there is no ignoring that peaceful frontier inhabitants were slaughtered in gruesome ways.<sup>66</sup> The intensity of the conflict was increased by ignorance and insensitivity on both sides, an ignorance created primarily by cultural differences.

Much has been written about the level of violence in European society in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, some of it to mitigate the stereotype of Indian savagery and cold-bloodedness.<sup>67</sup> Francis Jennings may be correct when he observed that "many of the aspects of so-called savage war were taught to Indians by European example," and that "plenty of sadism was evident in both cultures."<sup>70</sup> However, logical and correct observations concerning the pervasiveness of such practices do not ease the pain of a man viewing the ripped and mutilated body of his pregnant wife. Such a man feels only a blind hatred.

While it is important for historians to understand that the gruesome practices of the American Indian probably pale

---

<sup>66</sup> Douglas Edward Leach, The Northern Colonial Frontier, 1607-1763 (New York, 1973), 120-1.

<sup>67</sup> André Corvisier, Armies and Societies in Europe, 1494-1789 (Translated by Abigail T. Siddall, Bloomington, Ill., 1979), 4-6.

<sup>70</sup> Francis Jennings, The Invasion of America: Indians, Colonialism and the Cant of Conquest (New York, 1975), 160, 162.

in comparison to the torture methods used in the Inquisition, or the level of violence and cruelty experienced in the Thirty Years War, it must also be understood that those who experienced the violence, no matter what the source, did not have the same objectivity. André Corvisier wrote that for European society in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, because of the high level of violence, "the sight of blood did not bring about the same revulsion that it does today."<sup>71</sup> However, I suspect this is not the case. The frontier communities of northern New England experienced decades of bloody war, and there is no indication they were inured to death. Provincial soldiers, and the inhabitants of the frontier, experienced loss like they experienced their war, on individual and personal level. Samuel Ball apparently felt the loss of his father, and men like Benjamin Church detested the sight of hacked and mutilated men, women and children. Such pain and loss resulted in a desire for retribution, and retribution led to the escalation of bloodshed and atrocities. It is the escalation of bloodshed which fosters the erroneous conclusion that people had become insensitive, but it is only the legacy of hatred.

---

<sup>71</sup> Corvisier, Armies and Societies in Europe, 1494-1789, 4.

## AFTERWORD

After suffering the disastrous defeats of Lexington and Concord and Bunker Hill, General Thomas Gage observed that the New Englanders "in all their Wars against the French, ... never Showed so much Conduct, Attention, and Perseverance as they do now."<sup>1</sup> As Gage, like most British officers, had always viewed the provincials with the blinders of prejudice, his surprise is understandable. But Historians who have disparaged earlier provincial performance have had to explain the success of Lexington and Concord as well, and in their opinion, the British finally met the true citizen soldier. James Kirby Martin and Mark Edward Lender wrote that "Gage's regulars were not fighting against unfortunates who had been dragooned into service and whose primary goal was to stay alive. They had run into propertied freeholders operating locally, actually defending hearth and home. That was the unique strength of the militia system. Whether it could be equally effective on a broader scale, however, was yet to be seen."<sup>2</sup> To bolster this theory, historians stress

---

<sup>1</sup> Quoted in James Kirby Martin and Mark Edward Lender, A Respectable Army: The Military Origins of the Republic, 1763-1789 (Arlington Heights, IL, 1982), 19.

<sup>2</sup> Martin and Lender, A Respectable Army, 19.

the prevalence of the Whig ideology promoting the notion of a citizen soldier and abhorring the thoughts of a standing army. Although Lexington and Concord seemed to provide a confirmation of this belief, "by late 1776, patriot leaders would be consciously reverting to the French and Indian War pattern of seeking out the unpropertied in their quest to defend liberty and implant republicanism in America for the propertied citizens of society."<sup>3</sup>

The ideology of the citizen soldier was certainly important to pamphleteers and political leaders trying to justify their actions to peers at home and abroad, and there can be no doubt that many Massachusetts men were disturbed for ideological reasons by the presence of regulars in Boston, but it is doubtful this idea fostered superior military ability. In reality, the minutemen at Lexington and Concord and the provincial soldiers of the French wars represent no paradox. The men the redcoats faced on the march from Concord to Boston were fundamentally no different from the New England soldiers who served in those earlier conflicts. They initially attempted to face Gage's troops with a crude sort of linear battle, but in the end reverted to a combat style they were more familiar with, if not from personal experience, then from cultural consciousness. They fought the redcoats from ambush, utilizing available cover and aimed fire -- the tactics of *petite guerre*. Therefore, it is not so much ideology, but the more pragmatic issues of

---

<sup>3</sup> Martin and Lender, A Respectable Army, 20.



tactics and experience which explains the subsequent changes in American military service in the War for Independence, and in this respect George Washington's decision to fight a European style war with a European style army assumes greater significance.

Washington based his choice on three criteria: personal preference, tactical considerations and political realities. He had long been an admirer of the British army, attempting several times to obtain an English commission. Failing that, he tried to turn his Virginia regiment into regulars, including long term enlistments and strict discipline. It comes as no surprise, then, that Washington's opinion of colonial troops generally echoed British military leaders. During the last French war Thomas Gage told Washington that New Englanders were "the worst soldiers on the Continent," and the American army commander, viewing the mob gathered around Boston, apparently agreed with the assessment.<sup>4</sup>

Tactically, Washington was faced with fighting a war in the more settled areas of the colonies, where well over a hundred years of husbandry, building, and the production of naval stores had created cleared, open spaces. Unlike the wooded no-mans-land between New England and New France, here the methods of *petite guerre* were not as effective as the linear tactics of the European battlefield. Politically,

---

<sup>4</sup> Don Higginbotham, George Washington and the American Military Tradition (Athens, GA, 1985), 14-28. Gage is quoted on page 28; John E. Ferling, The First of Men: A Life of George Washington (Knoxville, TN, 1988), 126-7.

the use of European methods would legitimize the new American government in the eyes of potential allies like the French. The Americans needed to replace their old military partner in order to secure a supply of arms and ammunition and the essential naval support, and European leaders might have balked at aiding rebels employing the warfare of "savages".<sup>5</sup>

For whatever reasons, the adoption of European linear tactics altered the composition of American military forces. Americans had never fought this style of war.<sup>6</sup> The first major linear tactic engagement fought by Americans was the Battle of Long Island in 1776, and their decisive defeat accentuates their ignorance and inexperience.<sup>7</sup> Washington was well aware that soldiers needed extensive training to master linear warfare, which is why he instituted the three year enlistment, and these long term enlistments kept the traditional New England soldier out of the army. As Robert Gross discovered in his study of Concord, Massachusetts, after 1778 the down and outers, the have-nots, in society

---

<sup>5</sup> The need for naval support was underscored by Massachusetts efforts to capture the British fort at Castine, Maine in 1779. Acting on its own, Massachusetts raised an expeditionary force similar to the one sent to Louisbourg in 1745. The assault ended in disaster, however, when a handful of British warships scattered the large, but small and frail Massachusetts fleet of fishing craft and privateers.

<sup>6</sup> As mentioned in Chapter Nine, the first true linear tactic battle fought in America was the Plains of Abraham in 1759.

<sup>7</sup> Ferling, The First of Men, 168.

were sent to fill the Continental Army battalions. They were the same men who had always been used for long term garrison duty at frontier forts.<sup>8</sup>

After the war, the states retained the militia system, partially for ideological reasons, but also because the administrative function of the militia had served colonial governments reasonably well. But the new American government also recognized the principal weakness of the old system, and so they created a small standing army whose main function was provide a peacetime garrison for frontier forts. The leaders of this federal army, especially those produced at the new military academy at West Point, continued to focus on European strategy and tactics. They graduated with many of the same prejudices and beliefs which had guided George Washington, including a distaste for "militia" and a conviction that training and discipline were the hallmark of the true soldier. In this respect, then, as in so many others, the War for Independence was both a deviation from the past, and a harbinger of the future.

---

<sup>8</sup> Robert A. Gross, The Minutemen and Their World (New York, 1976), 150-2.

## **BIBLIOGRAPHY**

## SECONDARY SOURCES

- Anderson, Fred, A People's Army: Massachusetts Soldiers and Society in the Seven Years War. Chapel Hill, NC, 1984.
- Annals of Lancaster, Massachusetts, 1643-1825. Clinton, MA, 1884.
- Banks, Charles Edward, History of York, Maine. Boston, 1931-35.
- Bardwell, John D., The York Militia Company, 1642-1972. York, ME, 1972.
- Belknap, Jeremy, The History of New Hampshire. Reprint of 1831 edition, New York, 1970, Vol 1.
- Berens, John F., Providence & Patriotism in Early America, 1640-1815. Charlottesville, VA, 1978.
- Bourne, Edward E. The History of Wells and Kennebunk. Portland, ME, 1875.
- Bradley, Robert L., Maine's First Buildings: The Architecture of Settlement, 1604-1700. Maine Historic Preservation Commission, Augusta, 1978.
- Brown, M.L., Firearms in Colonial America: The Impact on History and Technology, 1492-1792. Washington D.C., 1980.
- Brown, William Howard, Colonel John Goffe: Eighteenth Century New Hampshire. Manchester, NH, 1950.
- Burrage, Henry S., Maine at Louisbourg in 1745. Augusta, ME, 1910.
- Clark, Charles E., The Eastern Frontier: The Settlement of Northern New England, 1610-1763. New York, 1970.
- Clausewitz, Carl von, On War. 1832; Penguin reprint, New York, 1985.
- Corvisier, André, Armies and Societies in Europe, 1494-1789. Bloomington, Ill., 1979, translated by Abigail T. Siddall.
- Cress, Lawrence Delbert, Citizens in Arms: The Army and the Militia in American Society to the War of 1812. Chapel Hill, NC, 1982.

- Crouse, Nellis, M., Lemoyne d'Iberville: Soldier of New France. Ithaca, NY, 1954.
- Demeritt, Dwight B., Jr., Maine Made Guns and their Makers. Hallowell, Me, 1973.
- DeWatteville, Herman G., The British Soldier: His Daily Life from Tudor to Modern Times. London, 1954.
- Dow, Joseph, History of the Town of Hampton, New Hampshire: From its Settlement in 1638, to the Autumn of 1892. Salem, MA, 1893; reprinted, Somerworth, NH, 1970.
- Dower, John W., War Without Mercy: Race and Power in the Pacific War. New York, 1986.
- Downey, Fairfax, Louisbourg: Key to a Continent. Englewood Cliffs, NJ, 1965.
- Drake, Samuel Adams, The Border Wars of New England, Commonly called King William's and Queen Anne's Wars. 1897; reprint of 1910 edition, Williamstown, MA, 1973.
- Dunnack, Henry E., Maine Forts. Augusta, ME, 1924.
- Eccles, W. J., Canada Under Louis XIV, 1663-1701. London, 1964.
- Eccles, W. J., The Canadian Frontier, 1534-1760. Albuquerque, NM, 1974.
- Evans, George Hill, Pigwacket. Somerville, MA, 1939.
- Ferling, John, A Wilderness of Miseries: War and Warriors in Early America. Westport, Conn., 1980.
- Ferling, John, The First of Men: A Life of George Washington. Knoxville, TN, 1988.
- Fiske, John, New France and New England. Boston, 1902.
- Frey, Sylvia R., The British Soldier in America: A Social History of Military Life in the Revolutionary Period. Austin, TX, 1981.
- Galvin, John R., The Minutemen: A Compact History of the Defenders of the American Colonies, 1645-1775. New York, 1967.
- Gilmore, George, Roll of New Hampshire Men at Louisbourg, Cape Breton, 1745. Concord, NH, 1896.
- Graham, Gerald S., ed., The Walker Expedition to Quebec, 1711. Toronto, 1953.

- Green, Samuel A., Groton During the Indian Wars. Groton, MA., 1883.
- Gross, Robert A., The Minutemen and Their World. New York, 1976.
- Haffenden, Philip S., New England in the English Nation, 1689-1713. Oxford, 1974.
- Hagan, Kenneth, and Roberts, William R., eds., Against all Enemies: Interpretations of American Military History from Colonial Times to the Present. Westport, Conn, 1986.
- Hamilton, Edward P., The French and Indian Wars: The story of Battles and Forts in the Wilderness. New York, 1962.
- Hanson, Charles E., Jr., The Northwest Gun. Lincoln, Nebraska, 1955.
- Higginbotham, Don, George Washington and the American Military Tradition. Athens, GA, 1985.
- Holmes, Richard, Acts of War: The Behavior of Men in Battle. New York, 1985.
- Houlding, J. A., Fit For Service: The Training of the British Army, 1715-95. Oxford, 1981.
- Howarth, David, Waterloo: Day of Battle. New York, 1968.
- Hutchinson, Thomas, The History of the Colony and Province of Massachusetts Bay. London, 1768, reprint Cambridge, MA, 1936.
- Jennings, Francis, The Invasion of America: Indians, Colonialism and the Cant of Conquest. New York, 1975.
- Johnson, Richard R., Adjustment to Empire: The New England Colonies, 1675-1715. New Brunswick, NJ, 1981.
- Jones, Archer, The Art of War in the Western World. Urbana, Il, 1987.
- Karsten, Peter, Soldiers and Society: The Effects of Military Service and War on American Life. 1978.
- Karsten, Peter, ed., The Military in America from the Colonial Era to the Present. New York, 1980.
- Keegan, John and Holmes, Richard, Soldiers: A History of Men in Battle. New York, 1985.

- Kennett, Lee & Anderson, James LaVerne, The Gun in America: The Origins of a National Dilemma. Westport, Conn., 1975.
- Kershaw, Gordon B., The Kennebeck Proprietors, 1749-1775. Somersworth, NH, 1975.
- Kupperman, Karen Ordahl, Settling with the Indians: The Meeting of English and Indian Cultures in America, 1580-1640. Totowa, NJ, 1980.
- Leach, Douglas Edward, The Northern Colonial Frontier, 1607-1763. New York, 1966.
- Leach, Douglas Edward, Arms for Empire: A Military History of the British Colonies in North America, 1607-1763. New York, 1973.
- Leach, Douglas Edward, Roots of Conflict: British Armed Forces and Colonial Americans, 1677-1763. Chapel Hill, NC, 1986.
- McLellan, Hugh D., History of Gorham, Maine. Portland, ME, 1903.
- Martin, James Kirby and Lender, Mark Edward, A Respectable Army: The Military Origins of the Republic. Arlington Heights, IL, 1982.
- Martin, Joseph Plumb, Private Yankee Doodle. 1830; reprinted New York, 1962.
- Mahon, John K., History of the Militia and the National Guard. New York and London, 1983.
- Marvin, Abijah P., History of the Town of Lancaster. Lancaster, MA, 1879.
- Moore, Howard Parker, A Life of General John Stark of New Hampshire. New York, 1949.
- Nash, Gary B., The Urban Crucible: The Northern Seaports and the Origins of the American Revolution. Abridged Edition, Cambridge, MA, 1986.
- Neumann, George C., The History of Weapons of the American Revolution. New York, 1967.
- Pakenham, Thomas, The Boer War. New York, 1979.
- Parkman, Francis, A Half-Century of Conflict. Boston, 1892.
- Parkman, Francis, Count Frontenac and New France under Louis XIV. Boston, 1896.



- Peckham, Howard H., The Colonial Wars, 1689-1762. Chicago, 1964.
- Pencak, William, War, Politics and Revolution in Provincial Massachusetts. Boston, 1981.
- Peterson, Harold L., Arms and Armor in Colonial America, 1526-1733. Harrisburg, Penn., 1956.
- Potter, Chandler F., The Military History of New Hampshire From Its Founding until the Present Time (Report of the Adjutant-General of the State of New Hampshire for the Year Ending June 1, 1866). Concord, NH, 1866.
- Prebble, John, Culloden. First Published, 1961; Penguin Books, New York, 1981.
- Prebble, John, Mutiny. First Published, 1975; Penguin Books, New York, 1978.
- Quint, Rev. Alonzo Hall, Historical Memoranda concerning Persons and Places in Old Dover, N.H. Dover Public Library.
- Rowe, William Hutchinson, Ancient North Yarmouth and Yarmouth, Maine, 1636-1936: A History. Yarmouth, Maine, 1937.
- Russo, David J., Families and Communities: A New View of American History. Nashville, TN, 1974.
- Rutman, Darret B., A Militant New World, 1607-40. New York, 1979.
- Scales, John, History of Dover, New Hampshire. Manchester, NH, 1923, Vol. I.
- Shy, John, A People Numerous and Armed: Reflections on the Military Struggle for American Independence. London, 1976.
- Slotkin, Richard, Regeneration Through Violence: The Mythology of the American Frontier, 1600-1860. Middletown, Conn., 1973.
- Stacey, C.P., Quebec, 1759: The Siege and the Battle. Toronto, 1959.
- Stachiw, Myron O., ed., Massachusetts Officers and Soldiers, 1723-1743: Dummer's War to the War of Jenkins Ear. Boston, 1979.

- Stackpole, Everett S., Old Kittery and her Families.  
Lewiston, ME, 1903.
- Stanley, George F. G., New France: The Last Phase, 1744-1760. Toronto, 1968.
- Steele, I. K., Guerillas and Grenadiers: The Struggle for Canada, 1689-1760. Toronto, 1969.
- Sylvester, Herbert Milton, Indian Wars of New England.  
Boston, 1910, Vol. III.
- Trask, William Blake, Letters of Colonel Thomas Westbrook and others Relative to Indian Affairs in Maine, 1722-1726. Boston, 1901.
- Trueman, Stuart, The Ordeal of John Gyles. Toronto, 1966.
- Turney-High, Harry H., Primitive War: Its Practice and Concepts. Columbus, SC, 1949.
- VanDerBeets, Richard, Held Captive by Indians: Selected Narratives, 1642-1836. Knoxville, TN, 1973.
- Vaughn, Alden T., New England Frontier: Puritans and Indians, 1620-1675. Boston, 1965.
- Wadleigh, George, Notable Events in the History of Dover from the First Settlement in 1623 to 1865. Dover, NH, 1913.
- Weeden, William B., Economic and Social History of New England, 1620-1789. Reprint, New York, 1963.
- Weigley, Russell F., The American Way of War: A History of the United States Military Strategy and Policy. New York, 1975.
- Wiener, Frederick B., Civilians Under Military Justice: The British Practice since 1689, Especially in North America. Chicago, 1967.

#### ARTICLES

- Alexander, Jon T., "Christian Attitudes Toward War in Colonial America," Church and Society, LXIV (1974), 16-24.

- Anderson, F.W., "Why Did Colonial New Englanders Make Bad Soldiers? Contractual Principles and Military Conduct during the Seven Years War," William and Mary Quarterly, 3rd Series, 38 (July, 1981), 393-417.
- Anderson, Fred, "A People's Army: Provincial Military Service in Massachusetts During the Seven Year's War," William and Mary Quarterly, 3rd Series, (Oct., 1983), 499-527.
- Boucher, Ronald L., "The Colonial Militia as a Social Institution: Salem, Massachusetts, 1764-1775," Military Affairs, 37 (1973), 125-30.
- Bourne, Edward Emerson, "Garrison Houses, York County," Collections of the Maine Historical Society, 1st Ser., Vol VII (Bath, ME, 1876), 109-20.
- Breen, T.H., "English Origins and New World Developments: The Case of the Covenanted Militia in Seventeenth-Century Massachusetts," Past and Present, 57 (1972), 74-96.
- Breen, T.H., "Persistent Localism: English Social Change and the Shaping of New England Institutions," William and Mary Quarterly, 3rd Series, 32 (1975), 3-28.
- Carp, E. Wayne, "Early American Military History: A Review of Recent Work," Virginia Magazine of History and Biography, XCIV (1986), 259-284.
- Chamberlain, George W., "John Chamberlain, The Indian Fighter at Pigwacket," Collections and Proceedings of the Maine Historical Society, Second Series, Vol. IX, 1-14.
- Coffman, Edward M., "The New American Military History," Military Affairs, XLVII (1984), 1-5.
- Eckstorm, Fannie, "The Attack on Norridgewock: 1724," New England Quarterly, (1934), 541-78.
- Eid, Leroy V, "'National' War Among Indians of Northeastern North America," Canadian Review of American Studies, XVI (1985).
- Endy, Melvin B., Jr., "Just War, Holy War, and Millennialism in Revolutionary America," William and Mary Quarterly, 3rd series, XLII (1985), 3-25.
- Fairchild, Byron, "Sir William Pepperrell: New England's Pre-Revolutionary Hero," New England Historical and Genealogical Register, 130 (1976), 83-106.

- Ferling, John, "The New England Soldier: A Study in Changing Perceptions," American Quarterly, 33, no. 1 (1981), 26-45.
- Frey, Sylvia R., "Courts and Cats: British Military Justice in the Eighteenth Century," Military Affairs, 43 (1979), pp. 5-9.
- Gruber, Ira D., "The Anglo-American Military Tradition and the War for American Independence," in Hagan, Kenneth J. and Roberts, William R., eds., Against All Enemies: Interpretations of American Military History from Colonial Times to the Present. New York, 1986.
- Guerlac, Henry, "Vauban: The Impact of Science on War," in Earle, Edward Mead, ed., Makers of Modern Strategy: Military Thought from Machiavelli to Hitler. Princeton, NJ, 1943.
- Gwyn, Julian, "War and Economic Change: Louisbourg and the New England Economy in the 1740's," Revue de l'UdOttawa, 47, no. 1-2 (1977), 114-31.
- Hamilton, Edward Pierce, "Colonial Warfare in North America," Massachusetts Historical Society Proceedings, 80 (1968), 3-15.
- Higginbotham, Don, "The American Militia: A Traditional Institution with Revolutionary Responsibilities," in Don Higginbotham, ed., Reconsiderations of the Revolutionary War: Selected Essays. Westport, Conn., 1978, 83-103.
- Higginbotham, Don, "The Early American Way of War: Reconnaissance and Appraisal," William and Mary Quarterly, 3rd Series, 44, no. 2 (April, 1987), 230-73.
- Karsten, Peter, "The 'New' American Military History," American Quarterly, XXXVI (1984), 389-418.
- Keegan, John, "The Historian and Battle," International Security, 3 (1978-79), 140-5
- Kohn, Richard H., "The Social History of the American Soldier: A Review and Prospectus for Research," American Historical Review, 86 (1981), 553-67.
- Leach, Douglas B., "The Military System of Plymouth Colony," New England Quarterly, 24 (1951), 342-64.
- Leach, Douglas Edward, "The Cartagena Expedition, 1740-1742, and Anglo-American Relations," in Maarten Ultee, ed., Adapting to Conditions: War and Society in the Eighteenth Century. University of Alabama, 1986, 43-55.

- Mahon, John K., "Anglo-American Methods of Indian Warfare, 1676-1794," Mississippi Valley Historical Review, 45 (1958), 254-75.
- Marcus, Richard, "The Connecticut Valley: A Problem in Intercolonial Defense," Military Affairs, 33, no. 1 (1969), 230-42.
- Middlekauf, Robert, "Why Men Fought in the American Revolution," Huntington Library Quarterly, 43 (1980), 135-48.
- Peckham, Howard, "Speculations on the Colonial Wars," William and Mary Quarterly, 3rd Series, XVII (1960), 463-72.
- Reid, Ronald F., "New England Rhetoric and the French War, 1754-1760: A Case Study in the Rhetoric of War," Communications Monographs, 43, no. 4 (Nov., 1976), 259-86.
- Rogers, George V., "A Tragedy of Errors," New England Galaxy, 12, no. 2 (1970), 3-12.
- Sharp, Morrison, "Leadership and Democracy in the Early New England System of Defense," American Historical Review, 5 (1945), 244-60.
- Shortt, S.E.D., "Conflict and Identity in Massachusetts: The Louisbourg Expedition of 1745," Social History (Canada), 5, no. 10 (1972), 165-85.
- Shy, John, "Armed Force in Colonial North America: New Spain, New France, and Anglo-America," in Hagan, Kenneth J. and Roberts, William R., eds., Against All Enemies: Interpretations of American Military History from Colonial Times to the Present. New York, 1986.
- Wingate, Thornton J., "Ancient Pemaquid: An Historical Review," Collections of the Maine Historical Society (Portland, ME, 1857), Vol. V, 139-306.
- Webb, Stephen Saunders, "Army and Empire: English Garrison Government in England and Virginia," William and Mary Quarterly, 34 (1977), 1-31.

# UNPUBLISHED MATERIAL

Esbenshade, Ranz C., "Sober, Modest Men of Confined Ideas: The Officer Corps of Provincial New Hampshire." Masters Thesis, University of New Hampshire, 1976.

Fischer, Joseph, "A Documentary Study of Colonial Expeditions to Port Royal, Nova Scotia and Quebec in 1690." Masters Thesis, University of New Hampshire, 1955.

# PRINTED PRIMARY SOURCES

A Journal of the Proceeding in the late Expedition to Port Royal. Boston, 1690.

An Abridgement of the English Military Discipline. Boston, 1690.

Barlett, Joseph, A Narrative of the Captivity of Joseph Bartlett among the French and Indians. 1807.

Bland, Humphrey, An Abstract of Military Discipline. Boston, 1743; editions of 1744 and 1747.

Boone, Nicholas, Military Discipline: The Compleat Souldier or Expert Artillery-Man. Boston, 1701.

Boone, Nicholas, Military Discipline. Second Edition, Boston, 1706.

Brattle, William, Sudney Rules and Directions for Drawing up a Regiment. Boston, 1733.

Breton, William, Militia Discipline: The Words of Command and Directions for Exercising the Musket, Bayonet, & Carthridge. Boston, 1733; Facsimile Copy, East Winthrop, ME, 1975.

Church, Thomas, The History of the Great Indian War of 1675 and 1676 Commonly called Philip's War, also, The Old French and Indian Wars, from 1689 to 1704. Hartford, Conn, 1845 edition, orig. pub. 1716.

Dummer, Jeremiah, A Letter to a Noble Lord Concerning the Late Expedition to Canada. London, 1712; Reprinted Boston, 1746.

- Eastburn, Robert, A Faithful Narrative, of the Many Dangers and Sufferings, as well as Wonderful Deliverances of Robert Eastburn. Philadelphia, 1758.
- Gyles, John, Memoirs of Odd Adventures, Strange Deliverances etc. In the Captivity of John Gyles, Esq. Boston, 1736, facsimile reprint in The Garland Library of Narratives of North American Indian Captivities. Vol. 6, Washington.
- How, Nehemiah, A Narrative of the Captivity of Nehemiah How. Boston, 1748.
- Mather, Cotton, Decennium Luctuosum. 1699, reprinted in Charles H. Lincoln, ed., Narratives of the Indian Wars, 1675-1699. New York, 1913.
- Mather, Cotton, Souldiers Counsell'd and Comforted; A discourse Delivered unto Some part of the Forces Engaged in the Just War of New-England Against the Northern & Eastern Indians. Boston, 1689.
- Mather, Cotton, Military Duties Recommended to an Artillery Company. 1687. Boston, 1687.
- Mather, Cotton, Frontiers Well-Defended. Boston, 1707.
- Moody, Samuel, Account of the Indian Executed at York, June 29, 1726. Boston, 1726.
- Norton, John, The Redeemed Captive: Being a Narrative of the Taken and Carrying into Captivity the Reverend Mr. John Norton. Boston, 1748; facsimile reprint in The Garland Library of Narratives of North American Indian Captivities. Vol. 6, Washington.
- Pemberton, Ebenezer, The Souldier Defended & Directed as it was Delivered in a Sermon. Boston, 1701.
- Penhallow, Samuel, The History of the Wars of New England with the Eastern Indians. Boston, 1726, Facsimile reprint, Williamstown, MA, 1973.
- Sewell, Samuel, A Memorial Relating to the Kennebeck Indians. Boston, 1721
- State of the British and French Colonies in North America With Respect to Number of People, Forces, Forts, Indians, Trade and Other Advantages. 1755, facsimile reprint, New York, 1967.

Stevenson, Roger, Military Instructions for Officers Detached in the Field: Containing a Scheme for forming a Corps of a Partisan. Illustrated With Plans of the Manoeuvres necessary in carrying on the Petite Guerre. Philadelphia, 1775.

Wadsworth, Benjamin, Good Souldiers A Great Blessing. Boston, 1700.

Willard, Samuel, The Man of War: A Sermon. Boston, 1699.

### NEWSPAPERS

Boston Evening Post  
Boston Gazette  
Boston Newsletter  
Boston Post-Boy  
New England Courant

### PUBLISHED COLLECTIONS OF PRIMARY SOURCES

Acts and Resolves of the Province of Massachusetts Bay. Boston, 1869, Vol. 1692-1714.

Background of Selective Service. Washington D.C., 1947, Vol. II; Massachusetts Militia Laws; New Hampshire Militia Laws.

Calendar of State Papers, Colonial Series, America and West Indies. Reprinted, Vaduz, 1964, Vols. 13-24 (1689-1716), 33-35 (1722-27).

Collections of the Maine Historical Society.

Series I: Vol. III (Portland, 1853)

Series II: Baxter Manuscripts (Baxter, James Phinney, ed., Documentary History of the State of Maine), Vols. V (Portland, 1897), IX (Portland, 1907), X (Portland, 1907), XI (Portland, 1908), XXIII (Portland, 1916), XXIV (Portland, 1916)



Collections of the Massachusetts Historical Society (Boston)

- Series I: Vol. I (1794)
- Series II: Vol. III (1815)
- Series III: Vol. I (1825)
- Series IV: Vol. IX (1871)
- Series V: Vols. I (1871), VI (1879)
- Series VI: Vol. X (1899) - Pepperrell Papers

De Forest, Louis E., ed., Louisbourg Journals: 1745. New York, 1932.

Journals of the Rev. Thomas Smith and the Rev. Samuel Deane. Portland, 1849.

Maine Province and Court Records. Portland, ME, 1947, Vol III.

New Hampshire State and Provincial Papers.

- Vol. II: Bouton, Nathaniel, ed., Documents and Records Relating to the Province of New Hampshire from 1686 to 1722, Part I. Manchester, NH, 1868.
- Vol. III: Bouton, Nathaniel, ed., Documents and Records Relating to the Province of New Hampshire from 1686 to 1722, Part II. Manchester, NH, 1869.
- Vol. IV: Bouton, Nathaniel, ed., Documents and Records Relating to the Province of New Hampshire from 1722 to 1737. Nashua, NH, 1870.
- Vol. V: Bouton, Nathaniel, ed., Documents and Records Relating to the Province of New Hampshire from 1738 to 1749. Nashua, NH, 1871.
- Vol. XI: Hammond, Isaac, ed., Documents Relating to Towns in New Hampshire, "A" to "F" Inclusive (Concord, 1882)
- Vol. XVIII: Hammond, Isaac, ed., Miscellaneous Provincial and State Papers. Manchester, NH, 1890.

Proceedings of the Massachusetts Historical Society. Boston.

- Series I: Vol. XVI, "The Journal of Dr. Benjamin Bullivant"
- Series II: Vol. XIV, "Journal of the Rev. John Pike"
- Vol. XV, "Narrative of Mr. John Wise, Minister of God's Word at Chebacco"; Anon, "Phips Expedition to Canada"
- Vol. XLII "Journal of Benjamin Stearns"

## MANUSCRIPTS AND OTHER PRIMARY SOURCES

### American Antiquarian Society:

Curwen Family Papers.

Mass. Col. 1629-1869, AAS Box 3, Folder 11: Militia returns, Officers commissions and Misc. Papers 1696-1762.

### Dover Public Library:

Ham, John R., "Dover, New Hampshire Marriages, 1623 -1823." Manuscript, Dover Public Library History Room.

### Maine Historical Society:

"Mary Bulman to Husband, 1745," MHS Manuscripts.

"A List of Men Belonging to Fort Mary at Saco, 13 September, 1704," MHS Manuscripts.

"Thomas Westbrook to Governor, September 23, 1722," MHS Manuscripts.

"Governor Shirley to Col. William Pepperrell, October 10, 1743," MHS Manuscripts.

Moses Pearson Papers, Misc Box 4/13.

"Charles Frost to William Stoughton, Feb. 4 1694/5," Misc Box 42/10.

"William Shirley to Jeremiah Moulton, April, 1744," Misc Box 17/2.

John Bradley's Journal and Orderly Book, Misc Box 61/22.

Daniel Merritt's Journal and Orderly Book, Misc Box 61/23.

Journal of Colonel John Storer of Wells, Maine in the Expedition against Louisbourg, 1745. Type-written copy.

### Massachusetts Historical Society:

"Moses Butler to William Pepperrell, February 20, 21, 23, 1745," Pepperrell Papers, Belknap Papers.

"John Osbourne to William Pepperrell, February 18, 1745," Pepperrell Papers, Belknap Papers.

### Massachusetts State Archives:

#### Microfilm References:

Vol. 28: Letters of Jeremiah Moulton of York (Nos. 236-42).

Vol. 38A: Numerous Scout Journals from Dummer's War (Nos. 19-43, 46-54, 56-66, 72, 86-89, 93-124, 134-59).

- Vol. 51: Letters of Johnson Harmon of York (Nos. 370, 397).
- Vol. 52: Letters of Joseph Blanchard, 1725 (Nos. 272, 286); Letter of James Grant of Berwick (No. 235); Letter of John Lovewell (No. 141).
- Vol. 70: Nomination of Captain (No. 160); Fort William (No. 580).
- Vol. 71: Jabez Fairbanks of Lancaster (Nos. 565, 567, 568); Garrison List of Ensign Bragdon (No. 872); Garrison at Wells (No. 871).
- Vol. 91: Numerous Muster Rolls (Nos. 25, 26, 58, 61, 112-13, 144, 145, 154, 156, 209, 210).
- Vol. 92: Accounts of David Dunning (No. 151).

New Hampshire Historical Society:

Louisbourg Court Martial Records.

New Hampshire Archives:

Military Correspondence, 1745, 46, 48, 49.

University of Vermont, Special Collections:

"Journal of Lieutenant John Burk," Stevens Family Papers.